Miſcellanies:

In Five

ESSAYS.

I. *Upon the Office of a Chaplain.*
II. *Upon Pride.*
III. *Upon Cloaths.*
IV. *Upon Duelling.*
V. *Upon General Kindneſs.*

The Four laſt

By way of *DIALOGUE.*

By *JEREMY COLLIER*, M. A.

LONDON,

Printed for *Sam. Keeble* at the *Turks-head* in *Fleetſtreet*, and *Jo. Hindmarſh* at the *Golden Ball* over againſt the *Royal Exchange* in *Cornhill*. 1694.

Phil 8877.15.5

HARVARD COLLEGE
NOV 7 1903
LIBRARY

Same fund.

To the Reader.

'TIs some Years since the Publication of this small Treatise: I am still convinced the Interest of Religion is not a little concern'd in the Enquiry. The Office lies among Persons who have a great force upon Custom and Practise: And where the Motion is strong, the Direction should be well secured. 'Tis true Milton treats the Argument as he does the King, with great Contempt: But to be ill used by such a Hand, and in such Company, is rather an Honour than otherwise. The Scripture (says this Man) owns no such Order, and therefore they must be left to the Examination the Sons of *Sceva* met with. Bishops or Presbyters we know, and Deacons we know, but what are Chaplains? (*Eiconocl.* p.163.) He might have answered in his own Words, (p.164.) That they were Houshold Priests; and given an Instance from the Old Testament. For there we find that Micah entertain'd a Levite with Salary and Diet; and after all told him, he should be a Father, and a Priest to him. (*Judg.* 17.10.) It seems he did not think he had hired a Servant with his ten Shekels. As for the Heathen, They had a Modester Sense of Religion than to rob their Gods of their Ministers, and make them their own. The Roman Emperours were Priests themselves, but had none Belong to them till they were Dead, and Deifyed. Towards the Declension of Philosophy, now and then a grave Pretender was drawn off by the Steams of the Kitchin. Lucian ridicules these Men for their

Little Compliances. One of them it ſeems made his Court to the Lap-dog, *to improve his Intereſt with the* Lady. *But an envious* Foot-man *happening to ſmoke the Matter, broke a Jeſt upon the Favorite, and the Philoſopher, and ſpoiled All. But theſe* Sages *don't come ſtrictly within the Queſtion. They were only* Seculars; *and entertain'd upon the Score of Learning, not Religion.*

In the Church, the Buſineſs of a Chaplain ſeems not of the higheſt Antiquity. In the firſt Ages the Clergy were ſupported by their Biſhop, and generally lived under his Obſervation. (Can. Apoſt.) *And afterwards, when They removed from the* Mother Church, *They had* Titles, *i. e.* Cures *aſſigned them, much larger than ſingle Families. The firſt Chaplain I meet with was one* Majorinus, *a very unfortunate Perſon. He lived in the Reign of* Diocleſian: *And was* Ordained *by the* Donatiſts *for the See of* Carthage, *againſt the Catholick Biſhop* Cæcilian. *He was Set up and Countenanced by his Patroneſs* Lucilla, *a high Spirited Lady; who refuſed Communion with* Cæcilian, *for being Reproved by Him when he was Arch-deacon.* (Optat. Lib. 1. cont. Parmen.) *However, by the Story* Majorinus *might be no more than a* Reader *in the Family; who in the Cuſtom of thoſe Times was leſs than a Sub-deacon.*

The wrong Uſe the Rich Laity *might make of the Indigence or Ambition of theſe Houſhold Clergy, was I ſuppoſe the Reaſon why the Second Council of Orange* (Can. 9. *held* Ann. 533.) *allow'd*

low'd no Prieſt to Reſide with Secular Perſons, without the Biſhop's Leave.

Dr. Heylin *Reports* (Cypr. Ang.) "*That* "*Biſhop* Laud *obſerved the Intereſt of the Church* "*prejudiced by the great Increaſe of Chaplains in* "*the Houſes of private Gentlemen. To prevent this Inconvenience, and ſome others, King* Charles *the Firſt publiſhed his* Inſtructions *to Archbiſhop* Abbot, An. 1629. *containing* Orders *to be executed by the Biſhops in the Province of* Canterbury. *The* Inſtructions *were comprehended in ten Articles. The ſeventh enjoyns, That* the Biſhop ſuffer none under Noble-men, and Men Qualified by Law, to have any private Chaplain in his Houſe.

I have mentioned theſe Inſtances, to ſhew the Difficulty of the Office. 'Tis a nice Undertaking, and requires a more than ordinary Sufficiency. And therefore an Unexperienced, Unballaſted Divine, muſt be an improper Miſſionary. 'Twere well if he underſtood Something of Men and Things; if he was furniſh'd both with Matter *and* Form, *and rather Brought his Education than Received it. For a Diſadvantage in the Beginning of Buſineſs, is not eaſily overcome. There ſhould be Vigilance in Converſation, a Sweetneſs of Temper, an Unaffected Piety, and a noble Contempt of Intereſt. And ſince the Clergy thus engaged are more Numerous than formerly, they ſhould manage with the greater Care. For when the Prieſthood is miſunderſtood, Religion muſt decline of Courſe. And when Religion is gone, we have loſt the beſt ſupport of this Life, as well*

as

as the other. This Reaſoning muſt be allowed by thoſe who are not ſunk below the Doctrines of Providence. Indeed if a Man ſets up for a Sceptick, I don't expect the Argument ſhould Reliſh. But the Opinion of ſuch Judges is neither Credit, nor Misfortune. With theſe People a Jeſt paſſes for a Demonſtration; and to Laugh, and Confute, is the ſame Thing. It ſeems Truth and Falſhood depends upon their good Liking: And they have the peculiar Privilege of Wiſhing Things in, or out of Being, at Pleaſure. Who would expect ſuch Flights of Conceit from ſo humble Pretences? For an Atheiſt, if you will take his Word for it, is a very deſpicable Mortal. Let us deſcribe him by his Tenents, and Copy him a little from his own Original. He is then no better than a heap of Organized Duſt, a ſtalking Machine, a Speaking Head without a Soul in it. His Thoughts are bound up by the Laws of Motion, his Actions are all preſcribed. He has no more Liberty than the Current of a Stream, or the Blaſt of a Tempeſt. And where there is no Choice, there can be no Merit. The Creed of an Atheiſt is a degrading Syſteme, a moſt mortifying Perſwaſion. No Advantages can make him Shine: He ſtrikes himſelf out of all Claim to Regard: And has no Alliance to any honourable Diſtinction. He is the Offſpring of Chance, the Slave of Neceſſity, danced by foreign Impulſes no leſs than a Puppet. Ignoble in his Deſcent; Little in Life, and Nothing at the End on't. Atheiſm, the reſult of Ignorance and Pride; of ſtrong Senſes, and

ſeeble

feeble Reaſon; of Good Eating, *and Ill* Living! *Atheiſm, the Plague of* Society, *the Corrupter of* Manners, *and the Underminer of* Property! *What can the Raillery, the Reproaches, the ſupercilious Cenſures of this* Sect *ſignifie? Why ſhould They be raiſed above their Principle, and rated higher than their own Valuation? They are below all Conſideration, except that of* Pity, *and* Prayers; *and theſe I heartily give them.*

If the Plainneſs of what Follows *diſguſts the ſober Reader I am ſorry for it. 'Tis a Circumſtance which could not be declined without Prejudice to the* Subject. *The overſmoothneſs of an Argument, is apt to abate the Force. You muſt give it a Point to make way for Paſſage. Pleaſure cannot always be made the Vehicle of Health. And when the Caſe requires it, no Man blames the Doctor for preferring the Cure to the Palate. Beſides, the bare mention of ſome Practices is enough to expoſe them. And when Things are a Satyr upon themſelves, who can help it? The Deformity lies in the Monſter, not in him who ſhows it.*

I am far from deſiring a Depreſſion of the Laity, *or abetting any* Spiritual Uſurpation. *Honour and Civil Pretences are not Held at the* Will *of the* Church; *and therefore She ſhould not Seize without Warrant. To make* Orders *a* Patent *for Pride, and a Privilege for Misbehaviour, is much more than runs in the* Commiſſion. *I am pleading for no Cynical Neglect, no ill ſupported Forwardneſs, no Briſk-*

neſs

neſs above Mens Buſineſs, or their Talent. But then I hope 'tis no harm for Church-men to maintain their Liberty; and keep the Property of their Perſons to themſelves. Eſpecially ſince They live amongſt a Free People, *and have ſo good Evidence for their Title. Farther, There is no fear of* Levelling *from this* Enquiry. *For Independency does not ſuppoſe Equality: Freedom and Degrees are well enough conſiſtent.*

To prevent all Miſconſtruction. I willingly grant it no Diſadvantage to a Gentleman to Belong *to a Perſon of Quality, provided his Employment be* Secular. *But the Function of an Eccleſiaſtick, requires another* Relation.

ERRATA.

OFfice of Chaplain, page 4. line 25. for *at* read *that*. p. 35. l. 7. for *Inconſiderateneſs* r. *Inconſiderableneſs*. Eſſay upon Pride, p. 19. l. 13. for *indifferent* r. *different*. p. 56. l. 26. for *Inſcriptions* r. *the Inſcriptions*, p. 62. l. 31. for *that* r. *than*. p. 81. l. 2. for *fanciful* r. *ſo fanciful*.

THE

THE OFFICE OF A Chaplain

Enquir'd into, and Vindicated FROM SERVILITY AND CONTEMPT.

THE OFFICE OF A Chaplain

Enquir'd into, and Illustrated

FROM

SCRIPTURE

AND

CONSTITUTIONS.

THE OFFICE OF A CHAPLAIN Enquir'd into, &c.

Juvenal obſerves, *Sat.* 7. that the Practice of the Lawyers in his time was uſually proportioned to the Figure they made at the Bar; where he that appear'd in the beſt Equipage was ſuppoſed to have the greateſt ſhare of Law and Senſe in him: ſo that had the Vulgar had any Power in determining Right, a good Cauſe might oftentimes have been loſt for want of fine Cloaths to plead it in. Whether any part of this Vanity prevails with us, I ſhall not diſpute; however this Inference may be fairly allowed, That the Succeſs of Truth depends very much upon the Reputation of its Advocate. For the generality of Mankind, in regard they are not judicious and impartial enough to penetrate the bottom

of things, are more influenced by ſhow and appearance, than by ſubſtance and reality. And therefore if a Man's Perſon or Office happens to wear an uncreditable Name, and and falls under a general diſeſteem, though never ſo undeſervedly, he muſt not expect to be perſwaſive with others, though the nature and proof of what he recommends, may appear ſufficiently evident and weighty to an unprejudiced mind. For beſides that Men are not willing to learn Rules of Wiſdom and Conduct from thoſe they contemn, becauſe this looks like a diſparagement of themſelves, and ſets the deſpiſed Perſon in ſome meaſure above them, beſides, I ſay, they are not over-willing to be informed by ſuch Inſtructors; 'tis not often that they think they can: For 'tis generally taken for granted that Diſcourſes cannot riſe much above the Character of thoſe that make them; and that 'tis ſcarce poſſible for an inconſiderable Man to ſay any-think that is worth the taking notice of. So that when Men have entertained a little Opinion of any Perſon, he is under a mighty diſadvantage of fixing any good Advice upon them. The contemptible Notion they have of him gives their Judgments an ill tincture, and makes them unindifferent, ſo that they neither ſee things in their true colours, nor allow them their proper weight; but are

apt

apt to conclude the reaſonings of thoſe they diſeſteem reſemble the inſignificancy of their Authors, and ſo many a good well-meaning Argument is turned back and diſcountenanced, only for keeping ſuſpected unreputable Company.

Of the truth of this Obſervation ill Men are very apprehenſive, who being deſirous of enjoying the pleaſures of Vice, without coming under the diſcipline of Ignominy and Reſtraint, make it their buſineſs to miſrepreſent the Miniſters of Religion, depreſſing their Authority, and decrying the uſefulneſs of their Profeſſion; being well aſſured that when they have diſarm'd their Adverſaries (as they reckon them) of their Reputation, they need not fear any conſiderable diſturbance from them.

In purſuance of this Deſign they would fain perſwade the World, that the Clergy are ſo far from deſerving any additional Eſteem upon the account of their Office, that for this reaſon they ought to forfeit part of what they had before; as if Orders ſuppos'd ſome antecedent Crime, and were rather inflicted than given, and that thoſe who receive them ought to paſs for Perſons degraded from the privileges of Birth and Education, or at leaſt not to enjoy them without ſtain and abatement.

Now that there are ſome Perſons, and thoſe not all of the loweſt Rank, who ſeem to be of this unreaſonable Opinion, is too apparent; and therefore I ſhall deſire them to conſider, that thoſe who account the Prieſthood a leſſening of a Man's Quality, muſt either believe all Religion to be an Impoſture, or if they do own the Being of a God, their apprehenſion of him is ſo ſcandalous and unworthy, that I think it would be a kindneſs to them to ſuppoſe them Atheiſts: For 'tis not ſo monſtrous and provoking to deny the Exiſtenee of a Deity, as to ſuppoſe him void of Excellency and Perfection: To imagine him to be ſo far from being the Fountain of Honour, that He is rather to be accounted a diſcredit to thoſe who belong to him, and that a Perſon of Condition ought to be aſham'd of his Service; ſuch a Notion of God Almighty as this, beſides the Abſurdity of it, looks like a malicious acknowledgment of his Being, only to make him capable of contempt.

But beſides, at the Function of the Clergy in general is too often miſunderſtood, (which in ſuch a ſceptical and licentious Age we need not wonder at) thoſe who officiate in private Houſes lie under particular Diſadvantages: Here the Maſter of the Family uſually expects an extraordinary obſervance

obſervance from the Prieſt, and returns him leſs notice in exchange, than to others of the ſame Order and Condition. Now one would think in point of reaſon, that an Eccleſiaſtical (as well as a Civil or Military) Officer ſhould be more conſider'd within the limits and extent of his Employ than elſewhere, both upon the account of the Juriſdiction he hath there, and becauſe of the Advantage thoſe he is concern'd with, do or may receive from the Execution of his Office.

Now the reaſon of this unaccountable Practice muſt be reſolved into one or both of theſe Pretences; either

1. That a Clergyman officiating in a Family, ought to be entertain'd no otherwiſe than under the Notion of a Servant: or

2. Becauſe 'tis in the Patron's Power to oblige the Prieſt with Church-Preferment.

It will be therefore the Deſign of theſe Papers to ſhew,

1. That a Prieſt, or Chaplain in a Family, is no Servant.

2. That whatever fair Expectations the Patron may have given the Prieſt of future Advantage, thoſe are no ſufficient Grounds to juſtify an imperious Deportment on the

one hand, or a ſervile Submiſſion on the other.

I. I ſhall prove that a Prieſt, or Chaplain in a Family, is no Servant; the contrary of which I believe he is often thought to be, though 'tis not always ſpoken out. Now in order to the removing this Miſtake, I ſhall in the

First place anſwer thoſe Objections, which ſeem to have given the moſt probable occaſion of its riſe.

Secondly, I ſhall give a ſhort Deſcription of the Office of a Chaplain; and ſhew how much it differs from that of a Servant.

I. I ſhall anſwer thoſe Objections, which have given the moſt probable occaſion to this Miſtake; among which we may reckon the Prieſts being entertained with Diet.

But that eating at another's Table does not make a Man a Servant is plain; for if it did, then every one that viſits his Friend, if he happens to eat or drink without paying for it, muſt immediately forfeit his Liberty. If it be ſaid, That 'tis not eating now and then upon a Viſit which brings a Man into the Condition of a Servant, but doing it conſtantly, and with the ſame Perſon: To this I anſwer, That if eating by the year makes a Man a Servant for a year, than eating by the day muſt make him a Servant for that day; the only difference in this

this caſe is, that the one who eats but a Meal or two comes into his Liberty ſooner than the other.

But poſſibly 'tis the Prieſts contracting for Diet which makes him miſtaken for a Servant to him that affords it; and here 'tis ſuppoſed to come under the notion of Wages, becauſe the Prieſt is to do ſomething for it. Now becauſe a conſideration of this nature, whether it be received in Money or Diet, or both, is the ſame thing; I ſhall prove that a Man's Receiving Money in conſideration of beſtowing his Time and Pains upon another, does not make him a Servant to him that returns him a Recompence for his Trouble. For example, Lawyers and Phyſicians have their Fees, or their Wages if you pleaſe, and yet I ſuppoſe none will ſay that they are Servants to all the Clients and Patients that imploy them, and if not to all, then for the ſame reaſon not to any: The Judges have a Fee for every Cauſe which is tried at the *Niſi prius* Bar, and a Juſtice of Peace hath Money allow'd him for making a Warrant, which both of them may receive without forfeiting their Authority. The Houſe of Commons likewiſe have Penſions from their Electors, during the Seſſion of Parliament; I confeſs 'tis not uſually paid now, but if they did receive it as formerly they have done, I hope no one would

ſay

ſay a Knight of a Shire was Servant to a Man of Forty Shillings *per annum*, becauſe he contributed ſomething towards his maintenance. In all theſe caſes a Man is engaged in the buſineſs of others, and receives a conſideration for his employment, and yet hath no reaſon to be accounted a Servant for his pains.

If it be ſaid, that in moſt of theſe Inſtances the Salaries are aſſign'd by Law, and conſequently that there is no contract between him that receives and him that gives the conſideration; I anſwer, that there is a vertual, though not an expreſs contract, becauſe the People have agreed to conſent to whatever their Repreſentatives ſhall determine.

2*ly*, As to the caſe of the Lawyers, though their Fees are ſtated by Law, yet every one chuſes whom he will make uſe of; ſo that the voluntary Retaining any one, is no leſs than a plain Contract, and the giving him ſo much Money upon condition that he will plead for him.

3*ly*, 'Tis not the contracting for Money in lieu of ſome other exchange which makes a Man a Servant, for then every one that ſells for Money would be a Servant to the Buyer, and conſequently a Pedlar might make himſelf a Maſter of the beſt Merchant in *London*, if he ſhould happen to be ſo ambitious as to be his Cuſtomer: and which is moſt

moſt to be lamented, if a Man could not by way of Contract receive Money with one hand, without parting with his Liberty with the other, then the Landlord muſt be a Servant to the Tenant; for the bare contracting for Rent, though he never receiv'd a Penny, is enough to bring him Under; ſo that according to this Opinion, a Man cannot let his Farm without Demiſing and Granting away himſelf.

But further, That the entertaining the Clergy with Diet and Salary is no Argument of their ſubjection, will appear, if we conſider that we are bound to contribute towards the ſupport of our Parents, if they ſtand in need of it; and yet I ſuppoſe it does not follow that this makes us there Superiors: 'Tis ſo far from it, that our aſſiſting them is accounted part of that honour which the Fifth Commandment enjoyns us to pay them, and is ſo interpreted by our Saviour himſelf, *St. Matth.* 15. 4, 5, 6. The communication therefore of part of our Wealth to the Clergy officiating in our Houſes, is in reaſon nothing but a due reſpect to their Function, and a grateful acknowledgement of their Care: What the Prieſt receives from us is in effect offered to God Almighty, becauſe 'tis given upon the account of the Relation he hath to him, and the Advantages we recieve from thence. This is honouring God with

with our Subſtance, who in regard he ſtands in need of nothing himſelf, hath order'd thoſe Perſons (whom he hath ſet apart to keep up his Service and Worſhip) to receive what Men preſent to him in token of his Sovereignty and Providence. Thus what was offer'd to God under the Old Teſtament (except what was ſpent in Sacrificing) was the Prieſts Portion, aſſign'd by the Divine Appointment, *Numb.* 18. 8, 9. and in the 20*th. verſe* of that Chapter the reaſon why the Tribe of *Levi* was to have no Inheritance in the Land which was to be divided, is given, becauſe God promiſed to be their Inheritance, that is to give them thoſe Offerings which were made to him; and that this was a very liberal Aſſignment, and much exceeded the proviſion which was made for the reſt of the Tribes, might eaſily be made good, were it not foreign to the preſent Argument.

There are many other places in the Old Teſtament which may be alledg'd for the confirmation of this Truth, as *Deut.* 18. 2. *Joſh.* 13. 14. *Ezek.* 44. 28, *&c.* And that this practice did not depend upon any Cerimonial Conſtitution, but was founded in the unalterable reaſon of things, will appear if we look into the New Teſtament; where St. *Paul* tells us that God has ordained *that thoſe that Preach the Goſpel* (which

(which every Prieſt does who reads the New Teſtament) *ſhould live of the Goſpel*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 14. Our Spiritual Governors are *Miniſters of God* to us as well as our Temporal, *Rom.* 13. 4. and therefore the Apoſtle's Inference, *v.* 6. may in a qualified ſenſe at leaſt, be applied to them, *For this cauſe pay you Tribute alſo.* And that the ſame Apoſtle did not believe that a Conſideration of this nature, ought to ſubject the Clergy to Diſtance and Submiſſive Behaviour, is beyond queſtion; for he plainly tells the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. 9. 11. *If we have ſown unto you Spiritual things, is it a great thing, if we ſhall reap your carnal things?* It ſeems he did not believe this Favour ſo extraordinary, or to have any ſuch commanding quality in it, as to make him their Servant, or Dependant, if he had received it. Nay he tells them that he had *power to eat and to drink*; that is, God had given him a right to a competent Maintenance out of the Eſtates of thoſe he inſtructed; which without queſtion, where the circumſtances of the Perſon will permit, ought to be proportioned with reſpect to the Perſon Repreſented, and to the Nature and Quality of the Employ. 'Tis plain therefore that the Apoſtle thought that if God's Miniſters lived out of the Fortunes of their Charge, yet

yet they were not ſo mightily indebted beyond a poſſibility of Requital; but that the Obligation was full as great on the other ſide: and the reaſon why ſome Men now a days are not of the ſame mind is, becauſe the Concerns of another World have none, or a very ſlender Conſideration allowed them; for otherwiſe without queſtion Men would look upon thoſe as none of their leaſt beneficial Friends, who are appointed by God to guide them ſecurely in their Paſſage to Eternity: but now 'tis the Mode with too many to live as if their Souls were the moſt inconſiderable thing they carried about them.

5. It may be objected, That every Family ought to be under the Government of one ſingle Perſon, and becauſe the Prieſt is confeſſed not to be the Maſter, therefore he muſt be under command, and conſequently a Servant. Now this is ſo ſlender an Objection, that I ſhould have waved the mention of it, but that ſome People ſeem deſirous of being impoſed upon in this matter; and we know when Men are in love with a Miſtake, the leaſt appearance of a reaſon is apt to entangle their Underſtandings, and make them overlook the evidence of an Aſſertion they are prejudiced againſt.

To

To what is objected therefore I anſwer, That this Argument proves all Boarders Servants, though their Office or Quality be never ſo much above thoſe they ſojourn with. I grant the Prieſt is not to diſturb the Maſter of the Houſe in the Government of his Family, nor to intermeddle in his Affairs, (to do this were an unreaſonable Incroachment) but the living under his Roof makes him no more his Servant, than his Father or Mother are, when they reſide with him.

There may be ſeveral other things urged againſt the truth of the Propoſition I am to defend, but the ſolving the remaining Objections will fall in more conveniently, after I have given a ſhort deſcription of the Office of a Chaplain, and ſhown how much it differs from that of a Servant, and how inconſiſtent it is with it; which I ſhall proceed to.

1. Therefore, The Office of a Clergyman in a Family, is to Pray for, Bleſs, and give Abſolution to thoſe he is concerned with; which are all Acts of Authority and Juriſdiction. He is to Counſel, Exhort, and Reprove the Maſter of the Family himſelf, upon occaſion (though with reſpect to his ſtation) which Offices are inconſiſtent with the condition of a Servant, and muſt be very

very unſucceſsfully perform'd by him, as will further appear afterwards.

2. He does not receive this Commiſſion from the Maſter of the Family, or from any humane Authority, but from God himſelf, whoſe Deputy he is in things pertaining to Religion: He is not entertain'd upon any ſecular Account, or to manage any other Buſineſs but what relates to another World; and is Conſecrated to this Function by the Divine Warrant and Appointment, and conſequently he is God's Miniſter not Man's. The Place in which he is engaged is his Pariſh, and the difference between a Parochial Prieſt and him lies in this, that the extent of his Charge is not ſo large as that of a Pariſh-Prieſt; the one having but only one ſingle Family to take care of, and the other a great many: but the Office is the ſame, and therefore the one hath no more reaſon to be accounted a Servant than the other.

3. However Pride, Ignorance, or Inconſideration may ſometimes byaſs Mens minds, yet if they would but attend to their own practice, they would ſee that the concern of a Prieſt in a Family is no ſervile Employment; becauſe in the abſence of a Prieſt the Maſter of the Family ſupplies his Place, as far as lawfully he may, that is, in Praying and giving Thanks at Meat; which is a plain

plain confeſſion that Men are ſatisfied that 'tis very improper to employ any of their Servants in the performance of Holy Offices; the doing of which would be diſhonourable to God, and weaken the force and Majeſty of Religion; and therefore when one Conſecrated to Holy Miniſtrations is not preſent, God ought to be addreſſed to by a Perſon of the greateſt Conſideration in the Family; which implicit confeſſion of theirs, is both agreeable to the reaſon of Mankind in general, and the practice of the firſt Ages of the World, when the Civil and Eccleſiaſtical Authority were united, the ſame Perſon being both Prieſt and Prince in his Family; as appears from *Abraham*, *Iſaac*, *Jacob*, and *Job*'s erecting Altars, and offering Sacrifices: And before the Inſtitution of the *Moſaick* Law (in which God choſe a diſtinct Tribe to ſerve him in Holy Offices) the Firſt-born, among other conſiderable Privileges, had the Prieſthood annext to his Birthright.

4. This Notion of a Servant deſtroys the End and Deſign of the Prieſtly Office, it renders his Perſon cheap, and his Diſcourſe inſignificant, it cauſes his Reproofs to be look'd upon as preſumptuous, and makes a generous Freedom and impartial Plainneſs, to be interpreted a forgetfulneſs of Diſtance:

And yet this ſort of Plain-dealing is not more neceſſary toward any ſort of People than thoſe who are Wealthy and Honourable, the Nature of their Circumſtances being ſuch as make them much more apt to flatter themſelves, and to be flatter'd by others; which made St. *Paul* command St. *Timothy*, to *charge thoſe that* were *Rich that they ſhould not be High-minded:* The Apoſtle well knew in what great danger ſuch Perſons were of taking the height of their Condition amiſs, and confiding too much in it; for to this unhappy Miſtake they have not only the common Artifices of Self-love to betray them, but ſeveral confederate Circumſtances from without ſtrike in to carry on the Impoſture, and to cheat them into a wrong Opinion of themſelves. They ſee how they are reverenced and admired by almoſt all ſort of People, and that Men frequently reſign their Eaſe, their Liberty and Conſcience too, to purchaſe fewer Conveniencies than they are already poſſeſſed of: They find that Wealth and Reputation puts them into a capacity of gratifying their Senſes, and their Humour; gives them many Opportunities of obliging their Friends, and cruſhing their Enemies; and makes their Will a kind of Law to their Inferiours and Depen-

Dependants. Now theſe Advantages when they are not throughly examined, but rated according to the value which vulgar Eſtimation ſets upon them, are apt to ſwell them into an unreaſonable Conceit of themſelves; which Vanity is ſtill fed and inflamed becauſe they are often ſo unfortunate, as not to attend that theſe worldly Accommodations are things really diſtinct from their Owners; that theſe ornamental Privileges are but a decent Varniſh which enriches no deeper than the Surface; an Impreſſion, which though Royal, cannot alter the Mettal: But on the contrary they are apt to fancy their Fortunes and themſelves to be all of a piece, that this glorious Outſide grows out of ſome intrinſick Prerogative, and is the genuine Luſtre and Complexion of their Nature. And ſince a flouriſhing Condition is thus apt to impoſe upon Men, and hath ſuch a natural tendency to give them a falſe *Idea* of their own Excellency, have they not need of a prudent and conſcientious Friend, to inſinuate that they have no Eſſential Advantages above the reſt of Mankind, to awaken them into right Apprehenſions of things, and reſcue them from that Deluſion which their own Vanity, and the Ignorance or Deſign of others often puts

puts upon them? Therefore if Men would have their Lives correct and happy, they ought to encourage their Friends, (eſpecially thoſe who are particularly concern'd in the Regulation of their Conſcience) to tell them of their Faults; they ſhould invite them to this freedom, if not by expreſs Declaration, yet by affable Deportment, always receiving the Performance of the nice Office with demonſtrations of Pleaſure and Satisfaction. Did Men conſider how ſlippery and difficultly manageable an elevated Station is, they would eaſily diſcern that it was not the ſafeſt way to truſt altogether to their own Conduct, but to take in the conſtant aſſiſtance of a Religious Perſon, that ſo their Miſcarriages might be repreſented, their Conſciences directed in doubtful Caſes, and their Minds fortified with Defenſatives proper to the Temptations of their Condition and Temper. Indeed the very converſe of ſuch a Guide, if his Character were rightly underſtood, and prudently ſupported, would help to keep them upon their guard; and by ſtriking a kind of Religious Awe upon their Spirits, make their Converſation more ſtaunch and regular, and often prevent their falling into any remarkable Exceſſes: But theſe Advantages are all loſt upon thoſe who

who miſapprehend the Prieſt's Office, and entertain him upon the ſame account they do their Footmen, only to garniſh the Table, and ſtuff out the Figure of the Family. When a Man hath received ſuch a diſparaging Notion of the Prieſt, and rang'd him amongſt his Servants, there is ſmall likelihood of his being the better for his Company; for this Conceit will make his Carriage lofty and reſerv'd; his Words, Geſtures, and Silence, will all carry marks of Neglect and Imperiouſneſs in them: which are plain and deſigned Intimations that the Prieſt muſt not inſiſt upon the Privileges of his Function; that he muſt not pretend to any Liberty, but what his Patron is pleas'd to allow; with the Direction of whoſe Actions he is not to intermeddle, nor remonſtrate againſt the unreaſonableneſs of any Practice, nor ſhow him the Danger of continuing in it: for though all this be done with Caution and Tenderneſs, and Reſpect, yet he muſt look for nothing but Diſdain and Diſappointment in requital, for preſuming to admoniſh his Superiours; which is ſuch an Uſurpation upon Dominion and Quality as is not to be endur'd; being neither agreeable to the ſervile Employment of the one, nor conſiſtent with the Honour of the other.

5. This degrading the Prieſthood into a ſervile Office, takes off from that Veneration which is due to the ſolemn Myſteries of Religion, and makes them look common and contemptible; by being adminiſtred by Perſons not *ſui juris*, but obnoxious to the pleaſure of thoſe who receive them: God therefore to prevent his Ordinances from falling into contempt, and to make them effectual to procure the happineſs of Mankind, hath given his Prieſts Authority over all they are concern'd with; they are to *bleſs* the People in his Name, and the Author to the *Hebrews* tells us *That without contradiction the leſs is bleſſed of the better*, Hebr. 7. 7. They are called *the Lords Prieſts*, 1 Sam. 22. 17. *The Meſſengers of the Lord of Hoſts*, Mal. 2. 7. And in the New Teſtament, they are ſtiled the *Stewards* and *Ambaſſadors of God*; and made *Overſeers of his Church by the Holy Ghoſt*, 2 Cor. 5. 20. Acts 20. 28. The Senſe of which Texts, and partly the Words are by the Appointment of our Church applied to thoſe who are ordain'd Prieſts, to put them in mind of the Dignity of their Office, and the great Care they ought to take about the conſcientious Diſcharge of it.

I confeſs 'tis poſſible for a Prieſt to make himſelf a Servant; he may 'tis likely be

Steward

Steward or Clark of the Kitchin if he pleaſes, (as Biſhop *Latimer* complains ſome of the Clergy were forced to be in his Time, *Heylin's* Hiſt. Refor. p. 61.) but as long as he does not engage in any Employment which is intended for State, or the Convenience of Life, as long as he keeps to his Prieſtly Function, ſo long he may be aſſured he hath no Maſter in the Houſe; and for any to ſuppoſe he hath, is an unreaſonable and abſurd Miſtake; (to ſay no worſe of it) 'tis an inverting that Order which God made between the Prieſt and People, and denies that Authority which God hath granted for the Edification of his Church. It endeavours to deſtroy that Honourable Relation which the Prieſt hath to the Divine Majeſty (to whoſe Service he is appropriated) which God is pleas'd to dignifie him with, that he might have the greater Influence upon thoſe he is concern'd with, and be Succeſsful in the Execution of his Office: And therefore for a Patron to account ſuch a Conſecrated Perſon his Prieſt, as if he Belonged to him as a Servant, is in effect to challenge Divine Honours, and to ſet up himſelf for a God: For if he is any thing leſs, he muſt own that the Service of the Prieſt does not belong to him; for that in the very Terms

and Notion of it, is intended for no *Being* inferiour to that which is ſuppos'd to be Divine.

If it be objected, That the Prieſt hath obliged himſelf to remove with the Patron, when and whither he thinks fit, and therefore ſeems to be in the ſame Condition with the reſt of the Attendants: To this I anſwer, That this makes him no more a Servant than the travelling and ambulatory way of Living among the *Tartars*, would make the Prieſts Servants to the People, provided they were Chriſtians: To make it plainer, Suppoſe a Biſhop Ordain'd over the Company of a Ship, and that his Dioceſe lay only in one Bottom; can we imagine that he would loſe his Epiſcopal Power, and fall into the Condition of other Sea-men, as ſoon as the Ship was order'd to weigh Anchor, and began to make its Voyage from one Port to another: At this rate a Man may call a Guardian Angel one of his Domeſticks, becauſe for the Security and Protection of their Charge, theſe benevolent Spirits are pleas'd to accompany us from one Place to another. I grant the Scripture tells us they are ſent forth *to miniſter for thoſe who are Heirs of Salvation*, Hebr. 1. 14. but then we muſt allow them to be God's Miniſters not ours; and ſo likewiſe

likewiſe are thoſe of whom I am now Speaking, as among other Places may be ſeen from 2 *Cor.* 6. 4. God hath pleas'd to put the Clergy in joynt Commiſſion with the Angels themſelves, for the Guidance of, and ſuperintending his Church. When St. *John* would have worſhipped the Angel which appear'd to him, he is forbid to do it, and the reaſon alledged is, *becauſe I am thy Fellow-ſervant*, Rev. 19. 10. that is, as *Grotius* expounds it, we are both Ambaſſadors of the ſame King. And although St. *John*, and the reſt of the Apoſtles, had Privileges peculiar to themſelves, both in reſpect of the extent of their Juriſdiction, the infallibility of their Doctrine, and other miraculous Gifts with which they were endowed, to which Biſhops themſelves, much leſs inferiour Prieſts, have no reaſon to pretend; yet though God was pleas'd for the more ſpeedy and effectual planting of Chriſtianity, to qualifie the Apoſtles in an extraordinary Manner, and to give them a larger Commiſſion than to the Clergy of ſucceeding Ages, yet they all act by the ſame Authority, and for the ſame End; therefore the unfixt and moving Nature of a Cure, does not alter and degrade the Office of a Prieſt: He is not leſs a Shepherd, becauſe the Flock happens ſometimes to

wander

wander unaccountably, from one Paſture to another: He is bound to attend the Charge he hath undertaken, and muſt anſwer the Neglect of it to God; and when it does not continue in the ſame Place, to accompany its Motion, is no more a Diminution to his Office, than it is to that of a Judge to go the Circuit, whoſe Commiſſion is as conſiderable, though it travels with him from one County to another, as if he had been always fixt in *Weſtminſter-hall.*

If it be farther objected, That the Patron appoints the Hours of Prayer, which ſeems to imply ſomething of command: To this I anſwer, That in his chuſing the Time of Prayer, he does not appoint any Service for himſelf, but only declares when he and his Houſhold are ready for God's Worſhip, and deſirous of the Prieſtly Abſolution and Bleſſing; which is proper for him to do, becauſe the Family is employed in his Buſineſs, and under his Command; and therefore without his Permiſſion, they have not many times an Opportunity of meeting together for Divine Service: Which is ſtill more reaſonable, becauſe the Prieſt is ſuppoſed only to intend the Affairs of Religion, and to be always ready for the performance of his Office, and conſequently that

that Time which is moſt convenient for thoſe under his Care, and in which the Aſſembly is like to be moſt numerous, he is by virtue of his Office bound to obſerve, whether his Cure lies in a private Family, or a whole Pariſh.

But laſtly, it may be urged, That the 13 of *Hen.* 8. *cap.* 28. calls the Patrons of Chaplains their Maſters; and will any Man be ſo hardy as to queſtion the Judgment and Determination of the Parliament? But here we may obſerve, That this Act calls only thoſe Patrons Maſters, who can give Qualifications for Pluralities. Having premiſed this Obſervation, I anſwer, with all due Submiſſion and Reſpect to this Legiſlative Council; That if the Queſtion was concerning any Civil Right, then 'tis confeſſed 'tis in the Power of the Parliament either to limit, or take it away, becauſe the whole Power and Authority of the Kingdom is there, either Perſonally, or by Repreſentation; and therefore they may deprive any Perſon of his Honour or Eſtate (the Right of the Succeſſion to the Crown excepted) as far as they pleaſe: Not that 'tis impoſſible for them to act Unjuſtly, but only that what they Determine hath the force of a Law, becauſe every Man is ſuppos'd to have given his Conſent to it. But here

wander unaccountably, from one Paſture to another: He is bound to attend the Charge he hath undertaken, and muſt anſwer the Neglect of it to God; and when it does not continue in the ſame Place, to accompany its Motion, is no more a Diminution to his Office, than it is to that of a Judge to go the Circuit, whoſe Commiſſion is as conſiderable, though it travels with him from one County to another, as if he had been always fixt in *Weſtminſter-hall*.

If it be farther objected, That the Patron appoints the Hours of Prayer, which ſeems to imply ſomething of command: To this I anſwer, That in his chuſing the Time of Prayer, he does not appoint any Service for himſelf, but only declares when he and his Houſhold are ready for God's Worſhip, and deſirous of the Prieſtly Abſolution and Bleſſing; which is proper for him to do, becauſe the Family is employed in his Buſineſs, and under his Command; and therefore without his Permiſſion, they have not many times an Opportunity of meeting together for Divine Service: Which is ſtill more reaſonable, becauſe the Prieſt is ſuppoſed only to intend the Affairs of Religion, and to be always ready for the performance of his Office, and conſequently

that

that Time which is moſt convenient for thoſe under his Care, and in which the Aſſembly is like to be moſt numerous, he is by virtue of his Office bound to obſerve, whether his Cure lies in a private Family, or a whole Pariſh.

But laſtly, it may be urged, That the 13 of *Hen.* 8. *cap.* 28. calls the Patrons of Chaplains their Maſters; and will any Man be ſo hardy as to queſtion the Judgment and Determination of the Parliament? But here we may obſerve, That this Act calls only thoſe Patrons Maſters, who can give Qualifications for Pluralities. Having premiſed this Obſervation, I anſwer, with all due Submiſſion and Reſpect to this Legiſlative Council; That if the Queſtion was concerning any Civil Right, then 'tis confeſſed 'tis in the Power of the Parliament either to limit, or take it away, becauſe the whole Power and Authority of the Kingdom is there, either Perſonally, or by Repreſentation; and therefore they may deprive any Perſon of his Honour or Eſtate (the Right of the Succeſſion to the Crown excepted) as far as they pleaſe: Not that 'tis impoſſible for them to act Unjuſtly, but only that what they Determine hath the force of a Law, becauſe every Man is ſuppos'd to have given his Conſent to it. But here

here we muſt obſerve, that the Church is a diſtinct Society from the State, and independent upon it: The Conſtitution of the Church is founded in the Appointment of Chriſt, in that Commiſſion which he gave the Apoſtles and their Succeſſors, and conſequently does not derive its Authority from any Earthly Power. The Civil Magiſtrate never yet made Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, nor ever can; and therefore we may ſafely affirm, without any injury or diſreſpect to him, That he cannot make theſe Spiritual Offices greater or leſs than they are: Therefore if God hath made the Prieſts Office (as nothing is plainer in Scripture than that he hath) an Office of Government, Direction, and Superintendence over thoſe he is concern'd with, then 'tis not in the Power of the Parliament to make his Condition ſervile; becauſe no Perſon, or Society of Perſons, can take away that Power which they never gave: The Parliament may with equal Right Enact that Parents ſhall be ſubject to their Children, and that the Wife ſhall be her Husband's Miſtreſs, without a Compliment, as make the People the Prieſts Maſters, and give the Flock a Juriſdiction over the Shepherd: They may with the ſame Juſtice repeal the moſt Eſtabliſhed Laws of Nature, and invert the Right of the two former

former Relations, as of this latter; for this hath its Eſtabliſhment from the ſame God that the other have, and for Ends, at leaſt equally weighty, and momentous. This Power of their Spiritual Governours they have no more Authority to deſtroy, than they have to vote down the Canon of Scripture, or to decree Sacrilege to be no Sin: 'Tis granted, That all Eccleſiaſtical Perſons, as they are Members of the State, are ſubject to its Authority; and that a Prieſt, or Biſhop, may properly be a Servant to the Magiſtrate, if he holds any Secular Employment under him; becauſe in this caſe he acts by a Commiſſion from the Civil Government; but this only concerns him as he is a Member of the State, and does not in the leaſt affect his Spiritual Capacity: The Power which reſults from that, flows from another Fountain; and is given by our Saviour himſelf, and therefore cannot be weakned, or recall'd, by any State-Conſtitution whatever. Men ſhould do well therefore to conſider, That as a Prince hath no reaſon to take it well, if the People ſhould look upon his Officers as their Servants; ſo 'tis not over-reſpectful to God Almighty to ſuppoſe his Miniſters ſtand in that inferiour Relation to thoſe they are concern'd with.

I ſhall

I ſhall now proceed to the Second thing at firſt propounded, *viz.* to ſhow, That whatever fair Expectations the Patron may have given the Prieſt, yet theſe are not ſufficient Grounds for an imperious Carriage on the one hand, or a ſervil Submiſſion on the other.

1. This ſort of Deportment were unreaſonable, ſuppoſing the Patron had as full and abſolute a Right in Church-Preferment, as he hath in any other part of his Eſtate. For what can be a more ungenerous and ungentlemanly Practice, than to require that a Man ſhould reſign up his Liberty, and forfeit the Privileges of his Station, only upon the probability of receiving ſome ſort of Conſideration for it afterwards? How unlike a Benefactor does he look who ſets an Exciſe upon his bare Word, and clogs the expectation of future Advantage with preſent Inconvenience? Thus to anticipate the Revenues of a Favour, is like taking Uſury for Money before 'tis lent, which certainly is one of the worſt ſorts of Extortion, becauſe here a Man not only pays for that he hath not, but for that which poſſibly he may never have. But

2. Let us ſuppoſe the Prieſt in actual Poſſeſſion of ſome conſiderable Preferment, yet

yet being 'tis pretended to be given, it ought certainly to come diſencumber'd from all Conditions which may abate the Kindneſs of it. He that pretends to give, ſhould chiefly reſpect the Advantage of him to whom the Favour is granted. He ſhould demean himſelf towards the obliged Party, as if the Obligation had never been; that it may plainly appear, that his Intention in conferring it, was diſintereſted; that he had no little Deſigns of Profit or State, to ſerve in it; but that it proceeded purely from a generous Inclination to promote the Happineſs of another. Whereas on the contrary, to part with any thing out of a ſelfiſh Deſign, is an Exchange, not a Gift, which when 'tis done by a Perſon of Eſtate, is an Argument of a mean and mercenary Spirit. But then to purſue a Benefit with Superciliouſneſs and Contempt, to expect a Compliance with the moſt unreaſonable Humours; to give upbraiding and contumelious Signs of the dependance and unworthineſs of the Receiver; to require a Man to relinquiſh the neceſſary Freedom of one of the moſt ſolemn and honourable Profeſſions; this turns an Obligation into Injury and Affront, and looks like a malicious Trap ſet to catch a Man's Reputation. Who that hath either Senſe or Honeſty would

turn his Canonical Habit into a Livery, and makes himſelf uſeleſs and ridiculous for the greateſt Conſideration whatever? A worthy Perſon would ſcorn a Kingdom proffer'd upon ſuch diſhonourable terms.

3. If we put the caſe as 'tis determined by Law, this practice will appear ſtill more unreaſonable. 'Tis ſufficiently known, and were it not for the overgrown Prejudices of ſome Perſons, it were ſuperfluous to mention, that the Patron is ſo far from having a full Propriety in Church-Preferments, that his Right only conſiſts in a power to Nominate who ſhall enjoy them. Which very Nomination muſt be made within ſix Months, and fix't upon a Perſon Canonically qualified, otherwiſe 'tis wholly invalid. His Intereſt in Church Livings only enables him to give them away, not to keep them. He hath no Power to enter upon any part of the Glebes, or Tithes, or ſo much as to ſequeſter the Profits for the next Incumbent. He is only a Truſtee authorized under certain Conditions, to diſpoſe of the Patrimony of the Church, which is ſettled upon it by as good Laws as any he holds his Eſtate by. That Right which he hath was originally granted in conſideration of Works of extraordinary Piety, in building

or

or endowing of Churches: which is a Title very few (except the King) can pretend to, either upon their own, or their Anceſtors Accounts. From all which it appears, that the Patrons giving an Annuity out of his Eſtate, is a quite different thing from his Preſenting to a Living, and therefore his Expectations of Gratitude and Obſervance, ſhould not be ſet ſo high in this latter caſe. For here neither Law, nor Religion, allow the Donor to be a Penny the better for what he diſpoſes of; he cannot detain the leaſt part of it without Injuſtice and Sacrilege, nor confer it upon exceptionable Perſons without breach of Fidelity.

The Truſt indeed is honourable and weighty, it being in the Power of thoſe to whom 'tis committed to encourage Learning, and to provide the People with prudent and conſcientious Guides: but then I muſt add, that it ought to be diſcharged accordingly, and that thoſe who do not chiefly aim at theſe Ends in the exerciſe of it, have little either of Conſcience or Honour in them.

We have reaſon to believe that when the Church gave this Right of Preſentation to Lay-Patrons, (for that the Biſhops had originally the Right of judging the Quali-

fications of Prieſts, and fixing them in their reſpective Cures, without being accountable to a *Quare impedit* for their refuſal of the Peoples choice, might be made evident were it pertinent to the buſineſs in hand.) When the Church I ſay parted with this Right, ſhe had no Suſpicion of the Degeneracy of after Ages; but imagined that the Integrity, and Conſcience, if not the Munificence of the firſt Patrons, might have been tranſmitted to the Heirs or Purchaſers of their Right. The Piety of thoſe Times would have made it look uncharitable to have been apprehenſive of Reſignation Bonds, of forced Compoſitions, and Contracts for Farms, or Women. But ſome People have now learn'd to make bold with God Almighty, beyond the Imagination, as well as the Example, of their Predeceſſors; and to be guilty of thoſe Sacrilegious Frauds, which by the late Proviſion of our Laws againſt ſome of them, ſeem not to have been ſo much as thought on, in thoſe more Primitive and Religious days.

And here in point of Charity I think my ſelf obliged to deſire thoſe who are concern'd in the Rights of Patronage, to conſider before 'tis too late, how great a Sin it is to abuſe their Power; and through Covetouſ-

Covetouſneſs, or ſome other unwarrantable Principle, to betray the Church, which hath in ſome meaſure made them her Guardian: It imports them very much to reflect how unworthy and unchriſtian it is to play upon the Indigence or Irreſolution of another; and take an Advantage from the Unfortunateneſs of his Condition or Temper, to oblige him to mean and ſinful Compliances! And what an open and undiſguiſed Affront it is to the Divine Majeſty, to endeavour to make his Miniſters cheap and inſignificant; both before, and after the conferring our pretended Favours upon them. To create ſervile Dependances, and raiſe our private Grandeur upon the Endowments of Religion, is a perfect Contradiction to the End and Deſign of them. This makes the Church contemptible by the Strength of her own Revenues, and cauſes the Monuments of our Fore-fathers Piety to be inſtrumental in undermining, and expoſing that Faith they thereby intended to ſecure and advance: which whoſoever is guilty of, he may be aſſured he hath a Right to the Imprecations, as well as the Patronage of the firſt Endowers of Churches, which dreadful Legacy they were generally very careful to *ſettle* upon

ſuch irreligious Poſterity, *Spelman de non temerand. Eccl.*

In ſhort, To proſtitute ſo ſacred a Truſt as this is, to Pride and Ambition, is in effect to ſacrifice to the Devil with that which is conſecrated to God Almighty; and looks like a more provoking Impiety than *Belſhazzer*'s debauching to the Honour of his Idols, in the Veſſels of the Temple, *Dan.* 5. 3, 4. For here is not only an Abuſe of Holy things but Perſons too, and God is dishonoured in thoſe that Repreſent him upon a moſt ſolemn and important Account.

I ſhall now at laſt crave leave to deſire thoſe of the Clergy, who are engaged in the Families of Secular Perſons (for I mean no other) to reflect of what ill Conſequence it is to Religion for them not to aſſert their Office in a prudent defenſible way: and how cheap in their Perſons, and unſucceſsful in their Employment, they muſt neceſſarily be, if they betray the Privileges of their Function, by ſervile Compliance and Flattery. People will be apt to imagine (and not without reaſon) that thoſe who will cringe below the Gravity of their Character, to gain a little of this World, can ſcarce have any Great and Religious Apprehenſions of the other. Overmuch

much Ceremony in a Clergyman is frequently misinterpreted, and ſuppoſed to proceed not from his Breeding or Humility, but from a conſciouſneſs of his Meanneſs; and others are willing to allow him ſo much Senſe, as to be a competent Judg of his own Inconſiderateneſs; and ſince he confeſſes himſelf contemptible by his Carriage, they think it but juſt to treat him accordingly. For Men of Figure, excepting thoſe who are very Underſtanding and Religious, are apt to have Miſapprehenſions conveyed into them by over-proportioned Reſpect; and to imagine the Diſtance between him that gives it, and themſelves, to be much greater than really it is. Since therefore as things ſtand, there is ſome danger leſt Churchmen ſhould complement away the Uſefulneſs and Authority of their Calling; they would do well to decline ſuperlative Obſervance, for fear they give others a wrong Notion of their Employ, or be thought to have *Mens Perſons in admiration becauſe of Advantage.* It would be no more than requiſite, if they would reſerve their *Duty* for their King, their Biſhop and their Parents, and expreſs their Gratitude to their Patrons in Language leſs liable to Miſconſtruction, and more proper to the Relation between them.

For as they ſhould not be unwilling to own the Diſtinctions which the King's Laws have made, as they ought to make ſome particular Acknowledgments for the Favors and Civilities of thoſe they are more immediately concern'd with, and by inoffenſive and agreeable Converſation, prevent all reaſonable Suſpicion of their being diſpleas'd with the ſuperiour Quality or Fortune of others; ſo likewiſe are they obliged not to be ſo officiouſly, or rather paraſitically mindful of the Condition of any Perſon, as wholly to be forgetful of their own. For notwithſtanding the Diſadvantages they may ſometimes happen to come into the World with; the Conſtitution of the Government hath ſet them upon the ſame Level with the inferiour Gentry, as a reward of their Education, and out of regard to their Function: Now that the Laws were not Prieſt-ridden and ſuperſtitiouſly laviſh of their Honour in this caſe might, were it neceſſary, be abundantly proved from the reaſon of the thing, and the general practice of other Countries, both with reſpect to ancient and modern Times. Theſe Privileges therefore being confer'd upon juſt and publick Accounts, a Man is ſometimes bound to maintain; and to ſurrender them up to the ſuperciliouſneſs.

neſs of every aſſuming or ignorant Pretender, is a Reflection upon the Wiſdom, and Ingratitude to the Religious Bounty of thoſe Kings who granted them: and which is worſe, a Churchman by making himſelf Contemptible hath parted with his Power of doing good; and conſequently diſappointed the great End of his Calling. Whereas without doubt 'tis part of the Deſign of theſe Privileges to create a ſutable Reſolution and Preſence of mind in thoſe that have them, that ſo their Spirit being raiſed up to their civil Station, their Character and Department may be the better proportioned, and their Actions keep a truer Decorum with the Nature of their Office; that they might not be Over-awed, and almoſt ſtruck Dumb with the Glitterings of Title, or Fortune; but retain a graceful Freedom in Converſation, neither Idolizing Greatneſs, nor Neglecting it. The Intention of the Laws in diſtinguiſhing the Clergy from the Vulgar, beſides the Conſideration of their Merit, was to put them into a better Capacity to maintain the Honour and Intereſt of Religion among all ſorts of Perſons; that the Rich as well as the Poor might be advantaged by their Miniſtery, and when Perſons of Condition were to be told of their Faults, the Prieſt

might be fortified with a convenient Courage to give the Reproof, and the others diſpos'd to receive it without diſguſt and impatience. Now to be ready upon all Occaſions to reſent any dishonour done to Religion with a prudent Gravity and Aſſurance, carries ſuch a noble Air of Greatneſs and undeſigning Honeſty in it, that it Forces a ſecret Veneration from Enemies themſelves; and though a Man may happen to be unjuſtly hated for ſpeaking unacceptable Truths, yet he is ſure never to be deſpiſed. Whereas a diffident and unſupported Behaviour in a Clergyman, is often ſuppos'd to proceed from ignoble Qualities, and conſequently will be ſure to weaken the force of his publick Inſtructions; it being natural for ill Men eſpecially, to diſregard, if not to deride the Admonitions of thoſe they believe are afraid of them; and he that cannot talk without concern before a Sinner of Quality any where but in the Pulpit, might almoſt as good ſay nothing to him there. For if a Churchman's Converſation be ſervile and deſigning all the Week, his appearing with a new Set of Notions upon the Sunday, will be interpreted only a formal Compliance with his Profeſſion: His preſſing thoſe Doctrines which his Practice contradicts, will ſignify little

little either to his own Advantage, or theirs that hear him: For though Men ought to mind what is ſaid, and not who ſays it; yet the Prejudices of the Generality are ſuch, that a good Cauſe uſually ſuffers very much when 'tis pleaded by an improper and exceptionable Advocate: How fulſom an Entertainment it is to hear a Coward harangue upon Valour, or a Covetous Miſer preach up Contempt of the World? The Man might better have ſpared his Rhetorick; for his commending thoſe good Qualities he neither hath the Honeſty or Courage to be Maſter of, is in effect but a Satyr upon himſelf, and ſerves only to make him more deſpicable and ridiculous; and which is worſe, the ſecret diſdain the Audience hath for ſuch a Panegyriſt, often ſlides from his Perſon to his Subject; which makes his Exhortation nauſeous, and helps to bring Virtue it ſelf into Diſgrace.

If it be objected, That the Poverty of ſome of the Clergy forces them to ſuppreſs their Sentiments in ſome things, and to ſuffer whatever an encroaching Spirit ſhall think fit to put upon them: To this I anſwer, That the Temptation to this Sin ought to have been prevented before their going into Holy Orders: For thoſe who

cannot

cannot be ſupplied with a competent Fortune by themſelves, their Relations, or at leaſt by ſome creditable independent Preferment, had much better chuſe ſome other inferiour Employment, than expoſe themſelves to ſuch apparent Danger in this: But if their own or their Friends imprudence, hath ſent them unprovided into the Church, 'tis more Reputable, Conſcientious, and to a generous mind more Eaſie too, to ſubmit to the Inconveniencies of their own Poverty, than to the Pride of others; and to prefer a homely, unornamented Liberty, to a ſplendid Servitude. And as for thoſe (if there be any ſuch) who do not diſcharge their Office with that Plainneſs, and diſcreetly managed Reſolution which God and the Church expects from them; it will not be improper to remind them of what Mr. *Herbert* hath written upon this Occaſion, *Country Parſon*, pag. 5. where he tells us, "That ſuch Perſons wrong the Prieſt-"hood, neglect their Duty, and ſhall be ſo "far from that which they ſeek by their "Over-ſubmiſſiveneſs and Cringing, that "they ſhall ever be deſpiſed. Indeed they have no reaſon to expect any better Uſage; for as Flatterly is deſervedly accounted one of the moſt contemptible Vices, ſo a Clergyman when he is guilty of it is the worſt

of

of Flatterers. To which we may add, That 'tis hard to conceive how the Oath againſt *Simony* can be fairly taken by ſuch Perſons; for certainly he that purchaſes his Preferment with the Prevarication of his Office, does no leſs contradict the Deſign of this Oath, than if he had paid down the full value in Money for it: He that hath barter'd away his Freedom and Uſefulneſs, (and as much as in him lies the Reputation of his Order) cannot in any reaſonable Conſtruction be ſaid to be Preſented *Gratis*.

Thoſe therefore who are this way concern'd, ſhould do well to conſider, How Mean it is to be over-awed, and how Mercenary to be bribed into an Omiſſion of their Duty! What a ſordid and criminal Perfidiouſneſs is it, to betray the Honour of their Function, and the Happineſs of their Charge, *For handfuls of Barley and pieces of Bread?* Ezek. 13. How ill do they Repreſent the God of Faithfulneſs and Truth; who either by verbal or ſilent Flattery deceive Men into a falſe Perſwaſion of Security, and diſſemble their Apprehenſions of Danger, when the Miſtake is likely to prove Fatal to thoſe that lie under it? Can they that pretend (and that truly) a Commiſſion from our Bleſſed Saviour, That good Shepherd, *who laid down his Life for the Sheep*;

Sheep; Can they have ſo little Charity for the Souls of Men, as to let them miſcarry out of Ceremony and Reſpect, and rather venture their being Damn'd than Diſobliged? How ſuch a Treacherous Obſervance will be look'd upon in the Great Day of Accounts is not difficult to foretell, were it not too ſad an Argument to dilate upon: However ſomething of the Guilt of it may be conceived by a remarkable Sentence of the forementioned Author, pag. 6. which ſeems to be no leſs true than ſevere, "They "(ſays he) who for the hope of Promo- "tion, neglect any neceſſary Admonition "or Reproof, ſell, with *Judas*, their Lord "and Maſter.

FINIS.

A

Moral Eſſay

Concerning the

Nature and Unreaſonableneſs

OF

PRIDE.

IN WHICH

The moſt plauſible Pretences of this VICE are examined.

IN A

CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

Philotimus and *Philalethes.*

A

Moral Essay

Concerning the

Nature and Unreasonableness

OF

PRIDE.

IN WHICH

The most plausible Pretences of this VICE are examined.

IN A

CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

Philotimus and Philalethes.

TO THE
READER.

I Eaſily foreſee ſome People will be diſobliged with the Freedom of theſe Papers, and think themſelves treated with too little Ceremony; But unleſs they can diſarm their pretended Adverſary, and confute his Arguments, I would deſire them by all means to ſmother their Reſentments: For as bad as the World is, to appear in defence of Pride, and turn Advocate for the Devil, looks like an untoward ſort of an Employment. However to ſweeten their Humour as much as may be, they may pleaſe to conſider that there was no good to be done in this Caſe without plain dealing; This Malady of all others muſt be well examined, otherwiſe it's in vain to expect a Cure. 'Tis to no purpoſe to declaim in general againſt a Proud man, and to give him a great many hard Names; for unleſs you point directly upon his Vice, diſtinguiſh it's Nature, and diſcover the weakneſs of that which he builds upon. Every one will be ſure to avoid the Charge and parry againſt the Application. Farther, to abate their Cenſure I think it not

improper to acquaint them that here are no particular Characters attempted, nor is there the leaſt intention to provoke or expoſe any Perſon Living. Beſides when a Piece like this is drawn from ſo many different Faces; *the mixing of Features and Complexions, will keep the* Originals *from being diſcover'd. In ſhort the Deſign of this ſmall Diſcourſe is only to make Men more uſeful and acceptable to Society, and more eaſie to themſelves than they generally are: And that thoſe who over-top their Neighbours upon any conſiderable account; may manage their Advantage with that Modeſty and good Humour, that none may have any juſt occaſion to wiſh them leſs.*

A

Moral Eſſay

UPON

PRIDE,

IN A

CONFERENCE

Between

PHILOTIMUS and PHILALETHES.

Philot. PHilalethes, I am glad to ſee you, though you are ſo wrapt up in Speculation that I ſcarce knew you at firſt ſight; pray why ſo thoughtful? you don't uſe to have ſo much Philoſophy in your Face.

Philal. I have a particular reaſon to look a little pretendingly at preſent; therefore I hope you will excuſe it.

Philot. With all my heart, for I ſuppoſe you will not make a practice of it: But what-

ever Emergency you may be under, I would adviſe you to appear in your old ſhape again; for in my Judgment that contemplative Figure does not become you.

Philal. I am ſorry to hear Thinking agrees ſo ill with my Conſtitution; but I hope this Alteration does not ariſe from any natural Antipathy I have to Senſe, but from the unacceptableneſs of the ſubject I am upon.

Philot. Pray if it be not too free a Queſtion, what were you muſing upon?

Philal. Why laſt night I happened to light upon an overgrown Fop, who plagued the Company with ſuch an impertinent Hiſtory of his Quality and Performances, and was ſo vain and inſolent in all his behaviour, that as ſoon as I was delivered from him, I had a plentiful occaſion to conſider the unreaſonableneſs of Pride; which is the preſent Employment of my Thoughts, and upon a full view, I find ſo much folly, and ill humour, and Monſter, in the Compoſition of this Vice, that I am aſhamed, and almoſt afraid, of the *Idea* I have raiſed.

Philot. 'Tis ſomewhat hard you can't ſtand the charge of your own Imagination; But though I ſhall not diſpute your Courage, yet I much queſtion your Mortification.

Philal. The Reaſon of your cenſure?

Philot. Becauſe I have obſerved it's but a bad Sign of Humility to declaim againſt Pride;

Pride; for he that is really humble will be unconcerned about Reſpect and Applauſe; ſuch a Perſon values himſelf upon nothing but his Conſcience and Integrity, and therefore the haughtineſs of another can't make him uneaſie; ſo that if he finds himſelf wince upon the account of neglect, he may be pretty well aſſured he has a ſore place.

Philal. I think you are ſomewhat out in your notion of Humility; for that virtue does not make us either ſervile or inſenſible, it does not oblige us to be ridden at the pleaſure of every Coxcomb. We may ſhew our diſlike of an imperious humour, as well as of any other fooliſh Action, both for the Benefit of others, and in vindication of our own right.

Philot. I am glad to hear this conceſſion from you, becauſe from hence it follows that a man may have a juſt eſteem of himſelf without being proud: Now if this obſervation was remembred and rightly applyed, men would not be ſo cenſorious in this point, nor miſtake their own Pride for their neighbours ſo often as they do. For inſtance, a man whom the Law has made my Superiour, may take notice of his Quality if he pleaſes; but this can't well be done, except he makes me an abatement of the regard he receives from me, therefore I ought not to interpret the *Reſerve* or *Familiarity* of his Car-

riage, as a Neglect, for provided he keeps within his proportion, he challenges nothing but his own; ſo that if I am diſpleaſed, the Pride lies on my ſide, for affecting to have an equal Regard paid to perſons who are unequal.

Philal. I have nothing to object againſt the main of your diſcourſe, and conceive that the beſt way to know whether we are guilty or not, and to prevent charging this odious Imputation unjuſtly upon others, is to ſtate the Nature of Pride, and to enquire into the Grounds of it.

Philot. I confeſs that is the way to pinch the Queſtion, therefore let what will come of it, I will ſtand the Teſt of your Method, though I am afraid you will ſay ſome unacceptable things.

Philal. Suppoſe I do; if the ſubject leads me to it, the fault is not mine: But to come to the point: Pride has a very ſtrong Foundation in the mind; it's bottom'd upon Self-love.

Philot. Then I find there is ſomewhat to work upon. ——

Philal. Pray give me leave, I ſay Pride is originally founded in Self-love, which is the moſt intimate and inſeparable Paſſion of humane Nature. The kindneſs men have for themſelves, is apt to put them upon overvaluing their own things: which humour unleſs

leſs check'd in time, will make them take moſt delight in thoſe Circumſtances and Actions which diſtinguiſh them from their Neighbours; and place their ſuppoſed Advantages in the beſt light. Now this deſign is beſt purſued by being Maſter of uncommon Excellencies, which though deſired by all, are poſſeſſed but by a few; for the Rareneſs of things raiſes their Eſteem, and draws a general Admiration. And their deſire of being diſtinguiſh'd, is one reaſon why they love to keep the odds in their own hand, and to make the diſtance between themſelves and their Neighbours as wide as may be, which often runs them upon a vain, and tyrannical Oſtentation of their Power, Capacity, &c. For this magnificent diſcovery makes the difference between them and their Neighbours the more apparent, and conſequently occaſions their own Greatneſs to be the more remarkable.

Philot. I think you have ſaid ſomething very remarkable, and I don't know but you may grow conſiderable by it, if you can prove your Aſſertion.

Philal. Pray what riſing Doctrine have I laid down?

Philot. You ſay that Pride is founded in Self-love, which is an unſeparable Paſſion of humane nature; from whence I gather, that it's impoſſible for a man not to be proud, be-

cauſe it's impoſſibie for a man not to love himſelf. We are like to have an admirable Preſervative ſtom you at this rate.

Philal. Not ſo faſt, If you had attended to the whole, you might have obſerved that by ſelf-love I meant the Exceſſes of it.

Philot. I thought a Man could not have loved himſelf too well.

Philal. If by loving you mean wiſhing himſelf happy, I agree with you; for we may, or rather we muſt deſire to be as happy as is poſſible, provided it be without prejudice to another. But then if Eſteem is underſtood by Love, it's eaſie (without care) to exceed in our own behalf; and in this ſenſe we certainly do love our ſelves too well, as often as we ſet an overproportioned and unuſual value upon any thing becauſe it's our own; as if our fondneſs and partiality was the true Standard of worth, and we had the faculty of turning every thing we touched into gold.

Philot. I will not conteſt this point any farther with you; but as I remember you ſtarted another Paradox, by intimating that it was a ſign of Ambition to eſteem any Excellency the higher for being uncommon: Now ſince the value of an Advantage is enhanſed by its ſcarceneſs, and made more reputable to the owner; I think it ſomewhat hard not to give a man leave to love that moſt which is moſt ſerviceable to him,

Philal.

Philal. So it would if he had no body to love but himſelf; but ſince he is both obliged and naturally inclinable to univerſal Benevolence, this alters the Caſe: for he who values any thing the more for being uncommon, will deſire it ſhould continue ſo, which is no kind Wiſh to his Neighbours, and is an Argument that a man does not delight in an Advantage ſo much for it ſelf, as for the Compariſon; not ſo much for its own irreſpective goodneſs, as becauſe others want it. Now it affords a more generous, and I believe, a more tranſporting pleaſure, to converſe with univerſal Happineſs, though we make no greater figure in it, than the reſt of our Neighbours; than to be gazed at, and admired by a Crowd of indigent and inferiour People.

Philot. The World does not ſeem to be of your opinion; however I will let your Argument paſs for the good nature of it. But after all let me tell you, though I have no mind to be counted proud, yet I have a ſtrong fancy for myſelf, and therefore if you will not allow me to be civil to my Perſon, we might e'en as good diſpute no farther, for——

Philal. Don't trouble your ſelf, if your Terms are moderate, we'll never break off upon the ſcore, therefore I will offer at a ſhort negative deſcription of Pride, in which

if it's poſſible, I will give you Satisfaction.

Philot. Pray let us ſee how liberal you will be.

Philal. Firſt it's no part of Pride to be conſcious of any perfections we have, whether intellectual or moral; for this is in many Caſes neceſſary, and impoſſible to be avoided. He that is wiſe or learned muſt know it, otherwiſe he can't underſtand when he judges true or falſe, nor diſtinguiſh difficult and noble Speculations, from trifling and vulgar Remarks, nor tell when he acts rationally or not. Now a Man that is ignorant of theſe things can neither be wiſe nor knowing: Therefore as he that has a juſt and vigorous ſenſe of the Magnitude, Diſtance and Colours of Objects, muſt conclude that he has eyes whether he will or not; ſo theſe perfections of the mind diſcover themſelves by their own Light. The Poſſeſſour can no more be ignorant of them, than he can doubt of his Exiſtence when he is awake. To give one inſtance more; How can any Perſon have true Fortitude, who does not know how far he ought to hazard himſelf, and wherein the baſeneſs of Cowardiſe conſiſts? So that to affirm a Man may be ignorant of his own conſiderableneſs, is to make him wiſe and great, and good by Chance, which is a contradiction to the Excellencies ſuppoſed in him.

Philot. Right. And ſince I like the Frankneſs, and tendency of your Argument, I'll try if I can reinforce it: I ſay then, ſuppoſing it was poſſible for a man to be ignorant of his good Qualities; it was by no means convenient: For if he carried ſuch a Treaſure about him, without knowing how well furniſhed he was; its ſomewhat hard to conceive, how he could either improve or uſe it. If it lay thus cloſe, it would be little better, than a Mine undiſcovered, for which neither the owner of the Ground, or any Body elſe are ever the richer,

Philal. You ſay well, and therefore I ſhall venture in the ſecond place to affirm, That as we may be acquainted with our own Accompliſhments, without being guilty of Pride, ſo neither is it any branch of this ſin to diſcover that they are greater than ſome of our Neighbours enjoy. If we have a real Advantage over another, it's no ſin to be ſenſible of it; to apprehend otherwiſe, is to judge contrary to the Reaſon of things, when the Caſe is plain, we may believe we have more Honeſty, Senſe, *&c.* than ſome others. This is as allowable as it is for us to think, that we have better Complexions than Moors, and are taller than Pygmies.

Philot. Can you go on?

Philal. Yes, I'm not afraid to add, Thirdly, that we don't fall into the ſin of Pride,

by

by being delighted with thoſe Advantages of Mind, Body or Fortune, which Providence has given us; theſe things in the very notion of them are ſuppoſed to be beneficial. Now it's natural and neceſſary for us to be pleaſed with the Enjoyment of that which is good; of that which is agreeable to our Faculties, and an Advancement of our Nature: To ſpeak ſtrictly, when the Faculty and the Object are rightly proportioned, Satisfaction follows of courſe, and its as impoſſible for us not to be pleaſed, as it is for fire not to aſcend: Farther, if we are not allowed to take any Satisfaction in our condition, we are not bound to give God thanks for it,; for we are not obliged to be thankful for that which does us no good: But nothing can do us any good, except it be by giving us a pleaſure either in hand or in proſpect. Fourthly, it is no part of Pride, to be more pleaſed with having an Advantage our ſelves, than by ſeeing one of the ſame value poſſeſſed by another.

Philot. Make this out and you will oblige me.

Philal. Very well: I prove my Propoſition thus. Firſt, Becauſe that which is in our Poſſeſſion, or incorporated into our Eſſence, is always in our Power, and ready to be made uſe of when we think fit. But that which belongs to another is often at a diſtance, and out of our reach, and can't be communicated to us, though the

the owner was never ſo willing. Secondly, it muſt be more agreeable to be Maſter of any perfection our ſelves, than to contemplate one of the ſame nature in another; becauſe every one is more certain of the kind Inclination he has to himſelf, than he can be of the Affection of any other Perſon whatever: That I will be always kind to my ſelf, I am as well aſſured of, as that I have a being; but that another will be ſo, is impoſſible for me to know: And therefore let a man be never ſo good natured, it muſt be ſomewhat more ſatisfactory to him, to ſee himſelf well furniſhed in any kind, than his Neighbour. Thirdly, that which is our own and in our Nature, we have the moſt intimate and vigorous ſenſe of; for the preſence of any deſirable Object, we know is more acceptable and entertaining than either the notion or Proſpect of it: Poſſeſſion gives us the Life of the thing, But hopes and Fancy can furniſh out no more at the beſt than a Picture finely drawn. So that, for Example, let a man be of never ſo generous and diſintereſted a Spirit, yet it's natural for him to be better pleaſed, withbeing rich himſelf (if he has any value for riches) than in having the bare Idea of an Eſtate: Beſides as I obſerved, that which is our own, is always at our diſpoſal, and does not depend upon the uncertain Inclination and humour of another.

Philot.

Philot. Very comfortably argued. I find then by your diſcourſe that a Man may without vanity be pleaſed with his Circumſtances, and have good Thoughts of himſelf too, if he deſerves it. Now ſome People are ſo unreaſonable, that they will neither give Men leave to love, nor underſtand themſelves; if they are conſcious of any commendable Quality, they muſt be ſure to lay it out of the way that they may not ſee it; nay if a Man has taken never ſo much care to make himſelf inſignificant, in order to the promoting of Humility, they will ſcarce let him know he is good for nothing, for fear he ſhould grow conceited of his Virtue. But I perceive you are not ſo ſtrait laced, and pedantick in your Notions. Therefore if you can recover us no more Ground, let us know directly what Pride is, and be as fair as you can.

Philal. Why Pride in the plaineſt words which I can think of, is too high an Opinion of our own Excellency.

Philot. How ſhall we know when we over-rate our ſelves?

Philal. That is a very ſeaſonable queſtion, and abſolutely neceſſary to the ſtate of the Caſe: Therefore I ſhall lay down ſome indiſputable Marks of this Vice, that whenever we ſee the Tokens we may conclude the Plague is in the Houſe.

Philot.

Philot. Let us hear your Diagnoſticks.

Philal. Firſt, Then we may be aſſured we have this Diſeaſe, when we value any Perſon chiefly becauſe his advantages are of the ſame nature with thoſe we enjoy, neglecting others who have an equal right to Regard, only becauſe their Privileges are of a different kind from our own. For inſtance, when Men who derive their conſiderableneſs from the Sword, the Gown, or their Anceſtours, think none worthy their Eſteem but ſuch as claim under their own Pretences; In this caſe it's evident it can be nothing but Partiality and Conceitedneſs which makes them give the Preheminence.

Secondly, We may certainly conclude our ſelves infected with this Vice, when we invade the Rights of our Neighbour, not upon the account of Covetouſneſs, but of Dominion; only that we may have it in our power to create Dependencies, and to give another that which is already his own.

Thirdly, When Men don't meaſure their civil Advantages by the Laws of their Country, but by their own fancies, and the ſubmiſſions of Flatterers; this is another infallible ſign they are Proud.

Fourthly, to mention no more, When Men love to make themſelves the ſubject of diſcourſe: To conn over their Pedigrees, and obtrude the Blazon of their exploits upon the

the company; this is an argument they are overgrown with conceit, and very much ſmitten with themſelves.

Philot. Though I think you have hit the ſymptoms pretty well, yet except they are marked ſomewhat more diſtinctly, 'tis poſſible for a Man to have moſt of them without being e'er the wiſer. For unleſs we are able to draw up a juſt State of the Degrees of merit, we can never take the true height of our Pretenſions, and being in this uncertainty it's odds if ſelf Love does not make us determine to the prejudice of our Neighbours. Now I would gladly know how we muſt go to work to be ſufficiently informed in this Point.

Philal. We muſt endeavour to get right apprehenſions of the ſeveral Excellencies of humane Nature, and what proportion they hold to each other: In order to the aſſiſting our Judgment in this caſe I ſhall lay down theſe general rules.

Firſt, Thoſe advantages which ſpring from our ſelves, which are the effects of our power and courage, of our Induſtry or Underſtanding, are more valuable than thoſe which are derived, and borrowed, becauſe they are a ſign of a Richer and more active nature.

Secondly, Thoſe Qualities which are moſt uſeful ought to have the Preference: for ſince acknowledgments ought to be ſuitable

to

to the nature of benefits received, thoſe who have the largeſt Capacity of obliging, may fairly challenge the Perheminence in our Eſteem; and therefore in the third place the duration of an advantage ought to be conſider'd; And that which has the firmeſt Conſtitution and is moſt likely to continue, ought to be prefer'd to others which are brittle and ſhort lived. Theſe rules carefully apply'd will ſhew us how far our pretenſions to Regard are ſhort of, or exceed other Mens, and ſo prevent an over-weening opinion of our ſelves. However, we are to obſerve that outward Reſpect ought to be given according to the Diſtinctions of Law, and though a Man may happen to be very defective in point of merit, yet we ought to take notice of the value Authority has ſet upon him.

Philot. Give me leave to put in a word, which is to tell you, that though I am not ſatisfied with your Inſtances, yet I am glad to find you will allow us different degrees of worth. I was almoſt afraid you would have ſet all Mankind upon a Level.

Philal. To deliver you from ſuch apprehenſions, I freely grant you that the Diſtinctions of Quality ought to be kept up for the Encouragement of Induſtry, and the ſupport of Government. I hope now you have the reaſon of my Conceſſion; you will not be ſo ſuſpicious for the future.

Philot.

Philot. No, not till you give me a farther occaſion; eſpecially ſince the inference of your diſcourſe is not unacceptable: from whence it followeth, that when a Man ſees plainly that he has the Advantage of his Neighbour, he may let him underſtand ſo much without any offence to humility.

Philal. No doubt of it, eſpecially when his ſtation is publick; but then the diſcovery of his ſuperiority ought to be managed with a great deal of Art and good nature, to which we are obliged not only in point of Complaiſance but Juſtice. For though there is often a real difference between one Man and another, yet the party who has the advantgae uſually magnifies the inequality beyond all Senſe, and Proportion. Men don't conſider that the great priviledges of humane Nature are common to the whole Kind; ſuch as being equally related to God and *Adam*, Reaſon and Immortality, the ſame number of Senſes, and much of the ſame perfection and continuance. And as for thoſe things which are the peculiar Advantages of a few; they are either acquired and enjoyed by the ſtrength of thoſe general ones I have mentioned, or elſe they are forein and in a great meaſure Chimerical, and therefore can be no real enrichments of our nature. They are often no more than the Bleſſings of Chance, of Flattery, and Imagination. And though they

may

may ſet us upon higher Ground, yet they can add nothing to the true Stature of our Being. But to combate this Vice more ſucceſsfully, we'll examine its moſt plauſible Pretences, and ſee if we can diſcover the weakneſs of them.

Philot. What pretences are thoſe?

Philal. I mean Learning, Nobility, and Power; for theſe you know are accounted the brighteſt and moſt diſtinguiſhing Advantages. But though they ought all to be conſidered, yet I believe there is much more Weight laid upon them, than in ſtrict reaſon they will bear.

Philot. You talk as if you were retained by the Mobile, and had a Mind to bring us back to our original State of Ignorance and Peaſantry.

Philal. I tell you once again you are much miſtaken. I have no deſign to leſſen the value of any mans Honour, or Underſtanding: Let People have as much Senſe and Quality as they pleaſe, provided they don't grow troubleſom and ridiculous about it.

Philot. I ſomwhat ſuſpect you have a mind to engroſs this Vice of Pride to your ſelf. This ſort of diſcourſe looks like declaiming againſt Arbitrary Power, where the ſharpeſt Invectives are commonly made by the moſt Enterprizing, and unmortifyed Men, who are only angry that they are not poſ-

ſeſſed of that abſoluteneſs themſelves, which they endeavour to render odious in others.

Philal. Hah! you are ſomewhat ſmart. However let me tell you, if I have any ſuch project as you imagine, you have me upon a fair Dilemma. For, if my reaſons againſt Pride hold good, they will ſtand upon record againſt my ſelf, which I ſuppoſe will be no unacceptable revenge for you: if they are inſignificant, you will have the diverſion of laughing at the folly of the attempt: and which is more conſiderable, you may keep your good opinion of yourſelf into the bargain.

Philot. Pray begin your attack as you think fit, and for diſputes ſake I'll try how far I can maintain the ground againſt you.

Philal. Firſt then, Learning (to begin there) and High Conceit agree very well together: for a Man of Letters may have a clearer notion of the ſtupidneſs and deformity of this Vice, and being better acquainted with the frame and paſſions of humane Nature, he can't chooſe but diſcover how unacceptable it muſt make him to all Mankind. Beſides he is ſuppoſed to know that nothing in ſtrict reaſon deſerves a true Commendation, but a right uſe of the Liberty of our Will, which is in every ones power to manage to advantage.

Secondly, Learning gives us a fuller conviction of the imperfection of our nature, which one would think might diſpoſe us to Modeſty

ſty. The more a Man knows the more he diſcovers his ignorance. He can ſcarce look upon any part of the Creation, but he finds himſelf encompaſſed with doubts and difficulties. There is ſcarce any thing ſo trifling or ſeemingly common, but perplexes his Underſtanding, if he has but ſenſe enough to look into all the objections which may be raiſed about it. He knows he has a being 'tis true, and ſo does a Peaſant, but what this thing is which he calls himſelf, is hard to ſay. He has reaſon to believe, that he is compounded of two very different Ingredients, Spirit, and Matter; but how ſuch unallyed and diſproportioned ſubſtances ſhould hold any Correſpondence and act upon each other, no mans Learning yet could ever tell him. Nay how the parts of Matter cohere, is a Queſtion which it's likely will never be well anſwer'd in this life. For though we make uſe of the faireſt *Hypotheſes*, yet if we purſue the Argument home, we ſhall go nigh to diſpute away our Bodies, and reaſon our ſelves all in pieces. Inſomuch that if we had nothing but Principles to encourage us, we might juſtly be afraid of going abroad, leſt we ſhould be blown away like a heap of duſt: For it's no ſolution to ſay the greater parts of Matter are connected with hooked particles; for ſtill the difficulty returns how theſe Hooks were made? *Quis cuſtodiet ipſos*

Cuſtodes? What is it that faſtens this Soder, and links theſe firſt Principles of Bodies into a Chain? And as the more refined Underſtandings know little or nothing of themſelves, and of the material World; ſo upon Enquiry we ſhall find them as defective in their Skill about Moral Truths: (excepting thoſe who are taught by Revelation, which ſupernatural Diſcoveries the unlearned are capable of underſtanding, as far as their happineſs is concerned.) Thoſe who made Laws in their reſpective Countries, we have reaſon to believe had their minds poliſhed above the vulgar rate: And yet we ſee how unaccountably the publick Conſtitutions of Nations vary. The *Perſians* and *Athenians* allowed Inceſt, the *Lacedemonians* Stealing, and ſome *Indians Herodotus* mentions, uſed to bury their beſt Friends in their Stomachs. In ſhort, the Rules of Decency, of Government, of Juſtice it ſelf, are ſo different in one place from what they are in another, ſo party-coloured and contradictious, that one would almoſt think the Species of men altered, according to their Climates; and that they had not the ſame Nature in common. One would almoſt think that Right and Wrong lay rather in the Fancies of men, than in the reaſon of things, and was bounded more by Seas and Rivers, than by any unalterable limits of Nature; that Virtue and Vice were minted

minted by the Civil Magiſtrate, and like Coins would paſs for Currant only in his own Dominions. The Heathen Philoſophers may fairly be granted to have as good pretences to Learning, as any other ſort of men among them: And yet we may obſerve from *Tully* and *Laertius* what a ſmall Proportion of ſolid Knowledge they were Maſters of; how ſtrangely did they differ in Matters of the higheſt Import? How eagerly did they diſpute, and not without probability on both ſides: Whether there was any thing certain? Whether the Criterions of Truth and Falſhood were clear and indubitable or not? Whether the Government of the World was caſual, fatal, or providential? How many *Summum Bonums* have they preſented us with, ſome of them only fit to entertain a Brute, others noble enough for a Spirit of the higheſt Order? It were tedious to recount the differences one Sect had with another, their Inconſiſtences with themſelves, and the ridiculous and ill ſupported Tenets ſome of the moſt famous of them have held. Inſomuch that *Tully* takes notice that there was no opinion ſo abſurd, but was held by ſome Philoſopher or other. 'Tis true they could wrangle and Harangue better than the common People; they could talk more plauſibly about that they did not underſtand; but their Learning lay chiefly in Flouriſh, and Terms, and

Cant; for as for any real Improvements in Science they were not much wiſer than the leſs pretending Multitude. Indeed the more modeſt of them would confeſs that the chief uſe of Learning was to give us a fuller diſcovery of our Ignorance, and to keep us from being peremptory and dogmatical in our determinations. Now one would imagine the more intimate Acquaintance we had with the Imperfections of our Nature, the greater reaſon we ſhould have to be humble. Is Weakneſs a proper Foundation to erect our lofty conceits upon? Indeed he that has not the leiſure or capacity to examine how it's with him, may be fondly perſuaded to fancy himſelf ſomebody, and grow vain upon the kind preſumption; but for a man to be proud who can demonſtrate his own poverty, is little leſs than Madneſs.

Philot. If the caſe ſtands thus, to make all ſure, we had beſt get an order to burn the Twenty four Letters, and hang up *Cadmus* in Effigie; for—

Philal. Pray don't interrupt me, and I will try if I can give you a little Eaſe. Granting therefore, as we may, that Learning does give ſome advantage, and that our Underſtandings are really enriched by it; yet in regard we have but a few Principles to build upon, the greateſt part of our Knowledge muſt conſiſt in Inferences, which can't be wrought

wrought out without great Labour and Attention of mind: And when we are at any diſtance from ſelf-evident Truths, the mind is not only perplexed with the Conſideration of a great many Circumſtances, but which is worſe, Forgetfulneſs or Miſtake in the leaſt of them, fruſtrates our whole Deſign, and rewards us with nothing but Error for our trouble.

Now he that is ſo liable to be impoſed upon, who riſes but by Inches, and enriches himſelf, by ſuch ſlow and inſenſible Degrees; 'tis a Sign that his Stock was either very ſmall, or that he is unskilfull in the management of his Buſineſs, and therefore he has no reaſon to be proud of what he has gotten: Beſides it's an humbling conſideration to reflect what pains we are obliged to take to muſter up our Forces, and to make that little reaſon we have ſerviceable. How faſt does Obſcurity, Flatneſs and Impertinency flow in upon our Meditations? 'Tis a difficult Task to talk to the purpoſe, and to put life and perſpicuity into our Diſcourſes; thoſe who are moſt ready and inventive have not their beſt Thoughts uppermoſt: No, they muſt think upon the Stretch, ranſack, and turn over their mind, and put their Imagination into a kind of Ferment, if they intend to produce any thing extraordinary: So that conſidering the Trouble and almoſt

Violence we are put upon, one would think that Senſe and Reaſon was not made for Mankind, and that we ſtrive againſt our Natures, when we pretend to it.

Philot. Well; What though our Minds were poor, and unfurniſhed at firſt, is it any diſparagement to us to have more Wit than we were born with? What though we can't ſtrike out a Science at a Heat, but are forced to poliſh our ſelves by degrees, and to work hard for what we have? The leſs we were aſſiſted by Nature, the greater commendation it is to our Induſtry, and our attainments are ſo much the more our own. And ſince we have thus fairly diſtinguiſhed our ſelves by Merit, why ſhould we ſeem unapprehenſive of our Performances? ſince we have paid ſo dear for the Improvements of our underſtanding, and our advantages are gained with ſo much Difficulty, what harm is it to make our beſt of them? Why ſhould we not oblige the negligent to Diſtance and Regard, and make thoſe who are younger or leſs knowing than our ſelves ſenſible of their Inferiority?

Philal. I agree with you as I have already hinted, that a Man may lawfully maintain his Character and juſt pretences againſt Rudeneſs and Ignorance, eſpecially when the publick Good is concerned in his Reputation. But when he acts a private part, and converſes

ſes with People of Senſe and Modeſty, he ſhould give them but very gentle remembrances of his Prerogative: his Opinion of his own worth ſhould but juſt dawn upon them, and at the moſt give them but an obſcure and remote notice, that he expected any ſingular Acknowledgment: He ſhould take the reſpect that is paid him rather as a Preſent than a Debt, and ſeem thankful for that which is his own: But to be ſtiff and formally reſerved as if the Company did not deſerve our Familiarity; to be haughty and contemptuous, and to make ſcanty and underproportioned returns of Civility: this is a downright Challenge of Homage, and plainly tells people, they muſt be very mannerly: 'Tis in effect to ſay, Gentlemen, I have more Learning, and have done the publick greater Service than you, and therefore I expect to be conſidered for it: you may poſſibly ſay that I have more preferment too, and am paid for my merit in mony, but that ſhall not ſerve your turn; for except you ſhew your ſelves very dutiful, I ſhall give you broad Signs of my diſſatisfaction, and never let you have the Honour of my converſe again. Now ſuch a Man if he went much abroad, would plague mankind more with his Company, than he could oblige them with his Writings, though they were never ſo conſiderable. Such People ſeem to

owe

owe their parts to their ill Temper: Their Induſtry is malicious, and they have taken pains not ſo much to oblige the World, as to get an Opportunity of trampling upon their Inferiours. Had they been good-natured, they would have been as dull and inſignificant as their Neighbours. But their imperious Carriage is juſt as reaſonable as it would have been for the old *Athletæ* to have drudged hard in Eating and Exerciſe, that they might employ their Bulk and Activity in beating every one who was weaker, and leſs skilful than themſelves.

Philot. By your diſcourſe you ſeem to miſtake the matter, and not to weigh things rightly. 'Tis not Superiority that theſe Gentlemen of Learning are ſo ſolicitous about; 'tis not perſonal Advantage which they chiefly intend by their Reſervedneſs: They have no doubt a more publick and generous Deſign; for you may obſerve they uſually bear hardeſt upon thoſe of their own Order and Profeſſion, which is nothing but a forced and politick ſtatelineſs for the promoting of Knowledg in others. The young Fry, whether you know it or not, muſt be held at a Diſtance, and kept under the Diſcipline of Contempt. If you give them any tolerable Quarter, you indulge them in their Idleneſs, and ruin them to all intents and purpoſes. For who would be at the trouble of

Learning,

Learning, when he finds his Ignorance is careſſed, and that he is eaſie and acceptable enough in the Company of the beſt Authors of the Town? But when you brow-beat them and maul them, you make them Men for ever; for *Vexatio dat intellectum*; though they have no natural Metal, yet if they are ſpurred and kicked they will mend their pace, if they have any feeling. Such rigorous uſage will make them ſtudy night and day to get out of this ignominious Condition, in hopes that it may come to their own turn to be proud one day. Take my word for it, there is no ſuch way to make a Scholar, as to keep him under while he is young, or unpreferred.

Philal. Notwithſtanding your Flouriſh I can't perſwade my ſelf that this Diſpenſation of Pride is ſo mighty uſeful as you pretend. I ſhould think ſuch an untoward management of any Accompliſhment ſhould rather diſcourage others from attempting ſuch dangerous circumſtances. If Senſe and Learning are ſuch unſociable imperious things, a good-natured Man ought to take eſpecial care not to improve too faſt. He ought to keep down the growth of his Reaſon, and curb his Intellectuals when he finds them ready to outſtrip his Neighbours. I aſſure you, if I was of your opinion, and thought my ſelf near the temptation to ſo much ill humour, I would never look on a Book again. *Philot.*

Philot. Come when you have ſaid all, there is no keeping up the Credit of Learning without that which you call a reſerved behaviour. For if thoſe who are eminent this way ſhould condeſcend to thoſe Familiarities which you ſeem to deſire, the honour of their Profeſſion would ſuffer much by it; if they ſhould converſe upon the Level, the veneration which their Inferiours have for them would quickly wear off: And if the vulgar obſerved there was no diſtinction kept up amongſt the Men of Letters; they would ſuſpect there was nothing extraordinary in any of them. Pray who are ſuppoſed to be the beſt Judges of Learning, thoſe who have it or others?

Philal. No doubt thoſe who have it.

Philot. Then if they ſeem to undervalue it themſelves, is not this the way to bring it into a general diſrepute? I tell you once again, if the privileges of Merit are not inſiſted upon all, muſt go to wrack. If a Man who has digeſted all the Fathers, and is ready to add himſelf to the Number, ſhews any tolerable countenance to one who has ſcarce rubbed through *Ignatius*, and lets a pure Engliſh Divine to go cheek by jole with him, the Commonwealth of Learning will grow almoſt as contemptible as that of the Pigmies, and be only fit to write Romances upon.

Philal.

Philal. I ſhall not enquire how far this lofty method may advance the Reputation of Learning, but I am pretty ſure it's no great addition to theirs who uſe it; for it only makes others more inquiſitive into their defects, and more inclinable to expoſe them. If they take them tardy they endeavour to humble them by way of Reprizal. Thoſe ſlips and miſmanagements are uſually ridiculed and aggravated, when ſuch Perſons are guilty of them, which would be overlooked or excuſed in others of a more modeſt and affable Converſation. If they happen to be found inconſiſtent with themſelves: If their vanity of appearing ſingular puts them upon advancing Paradoxes, and proving them as Paradoxically. If a preſumption upon their own ſtrength, and a deſire of greater triumph makes them venture too far into the enemies Quarters, and take up a Poſt which they can't maintain; they are uſually laught at for their folly and left to ſhift for themſelves; for Pride never has any friends, and all Men are glad of a juſt occaſion to leſſen his Reputation who makes ſuch an ill-natured uſe of it.

Philot. I conceive you harp a little too much upon one ſtring: do you think the inferiour Clergy for whom you are now pleading, are diſcouraged by none but thoſe of their own Profeſſion?

Philal.

Philal. No, I grant there is another ſort of People who uſe them with neglect enough: But then they are ſomewhat more to be excuſed. They have not ſuch fair opportunities to underſtand the juſt pretences of a liberal Education, and a Religious employment. They are apt to fall under unfortunate hands in their minority: The vanity of their Parents, and the Knavery of Flatterers often gives them a wrong notion of themſelves, and makes them admire nothing but Wealt hand Greatneſs, and think no condition deſerves regard but that which reſembles their own. Beſides their neglect looks leſs unaccountably by reaſon of their Quality, and their Breeding makes their Pride ſit more decently upon them. They uſually contemn with a better Grace than others: for there is a great deal of Art and Myſtery in Pride to manage it handſomely: A man might almoſt as ſoon learn a Trade: and if we obſerve we ſhall find that thoſe who were not brought up to it, ſeldom prove their Crafts-maſter or practiſe with any ſort of addreſs. To which I may add, that ſuch Perſons are uſually willing to pay for their imperiouſneſs, ſo that a Man is not made a Fool for nothing. But when this lofty humour is clumſily and inartificially managed, when it's affected by thoſe of a ſelf-denying and mortified Profeſſion, and who get their Living by declaiming againſt it.

it. When it's taken up by Men of Senſe, who may well be expected to ſee through the folly of this Vice, and who generally have not thoſe pretences of a byaſſed Education to miſguide them: eſpecially when they play it upon Perſons of their own Order who were born and bred to as fair Expectations of Regard as themſelves, and are ſometimes their Inferiours in nothing ſo much as in Succeſs; this is ſuch a ſingular Practice that I had rather leave it undeſcribed than be forced to give it its proper Character.

Philot. I believe you will be willing to abate, if not to retract your cenſure when you conſider that theſe Gentlemen of the Gown, whom you think too much depreſſed, are many of them Curates; and is it not very reaſonable there ſhould be a diſtance obſerved between Maſters and Servants? If you confound theſe two Relations by laviſh and indiſcreet Familiarities, you deſtroy the reſpect, and by degrees the very notion of Superiority. If there is not a due Homage paid in Converſation, thoſe who are in a ſtate of ſubjection will neither know their Condition nor their Duty: They will be apt to forget they hold by a ſervile Tenure, and think themſelves enfranchiſed from all manner of Suit and Service. Beſides, if the Parſon ſhould uſe his Curate with that freedom which you inſinuate, as if there was neither dependence

nor

nor obligation between them; this might be of very ill example to the Pariſh, and make all other ſervants challenge the ſame liberty, and grow pert upon their Maſters: And when this Sawcineſs became univerſal, as it's likely it might do in a ſhort time, what leſs Miſchief could be expected from it, than an old *Scythian* Rebellion?

Philal. I confeſs, I was not aware the being of Government depended ſo much upon the diſtinction between Rector and Curate, and that if the modern way of Diſtance and Subordination was not kept up, we muſt preſently return to *Hobs*'s ſtate of Nature. If a Curate be ſuch a dangerous thing, that a little civil Uſage to him is ready to make the World fall about our Ears, I wonder why ſo many of them are ſuffered. Now without raiſing the *poſſe Comitatus*, if the Pluraliſts would but do their beſt to ſuppreſs them, their Number might quickly be ſo retrenched, that they would not be in the leaſt formidable. But you ſeem to argue all this while upon a wrong Principle, you take it for granted, that Curates are Servants; now if this proves a miſtake, you will own they may be treated with a little more freedom, without any danger to Authority.

Philot. Who doubts of their being Servants?

Philal.

Philal. I do, and for very good reaſons.

Philot. See how a Man may be miſtaken! I thought the *Engliſh* of Curate had been an Eccleſiaſtical Hireling.

Philal. No ſuch matter, the proper import of the Word ſignifies one who has the Cure of Souls; therefore in *France* all Parochial Prieſts are called Curates, as they are likewiſe in our Rubrick and Common-Prayer.

Philot. I find then there lies no Servitude in the Name, ſo that it muſt be either the Deputation, or Salary which they receive from the Inſtituted Prieſt, which ſinks them into this condition.

Philal. That there is no Servitude in either of theſe, I am ready to make good. 1. Not in the Office; and here I muſt crave leave to ask you a few Queſtions.

Philot. Take your own method.

Philal. What in your apprehenſion is a Curate's Employment?

Philot. To ſerve God in the publick Offices of Religion, and to take care of the Pariſh.

Philal. Then he is not entertained to ſerve the Rector.

Philot. Go on.

Philal. In the next place I deſire to know whether Authority is not eſſential to a Maſter?

Philot. Who queſtions it?

Philal. Has the Curate his Authority to Preach, and Administer the Sacraments from the Rector?

Philot. No, from the Bishop.

Philal. May not a Master turn away his Servants when he pleases?

Philot. I think so.

Philal. But the Rector has no power to remove the Curate after he is Licensed and Fixed by the Bishop. To sum up the Evidence therefore; if the Curate was not entertained to wait upon the Rector, nor has his Authority from him, nor can be removed from his Employment, I think it is pretty plain he is none of his Servant.

Philot. Well, but does not the Parson make choice of him, and pay him?

Philal. Don't a Corporation choose a Mayor?

Philot. What then?

Philal. Pray whose Servant is he after his Election?

Philot. None but the Kings that I know of: but you have not answered the latter part of my objection about his being paid by the Rector.

Philal. If you had not called for my answer, I had waved it for your sake, because I think your objection borders somewhat upon Treason.

Philot. How so?

Philal.

Philal. Why, is it not of kin to Treason to say the Subjects are Masters over the Supreme Authority?

Philot. If Nonsense will not excuse a Man, I think it is.

Philal. But your Argument proves the King a Servant to the People.

Philot. How?

Philal. Because they pay him Taxes, and that among other reasons, by way of acknowledgment of the benefits of his Government, and that they may shew themselves willing, if it was in their power, to requite him for his care of the State.

Philot. Pray why so much concerned to prove Curates no Servants?

Philal. Because I am willing to rescue them from that contempt, which they will certainly fall into, as long as they pass under this notion: which considering the number of persons Officiating this way, must be very prejudicial to Religion. Besides it makes some persons, who are fit to do the Church service, suspend themselves, and shew their Priesthood only by their Habit, rather than serve God under such untreditable circumstances: and for the same reason others are tempted to grow too fond of a Presentation, and choose rather to court it by Flattery, or other indirect practices, than be condemned to the servile condition of a Curate. For let me tell you, it is

no ordinary piece of Self-Denial, for a Man of a generous Education, who has been trained up all along to Freedom and good Uſage, to be degraded in his Manhood, when the mind is moſt in love with Liberty, and to enter upon Buſineſs with marks of diſadvantage, when he ſtands moſt in need of Reputation. To my thinking this is a very diſcouraging and prepoſterous way of Educating the Clergy. If a Man muſt go to ſervice, he had better begin with it as they do in Trades, and not be Maſter at firſt, and then be forced to turn Apprentice, or Journyman afterwards. Of ſuch ill conſequence it is to miſcal things, and as *Plato* obſerves, that an alteration of the Notes in Muſick is apt to produce an Innovation in the Laws and Cuſtoms of a Country: ſo by changing the names of Offices for others of leſs Repute, we change the Uſes and Deſigns of them, and make them leſs ſatisfactory to thoſe engaged, and leſs ſerviceable to the Publick than they would have been, if the Character of their Inſtitution had been kept up.

Philot. Granting at preſent what you ſay to be true, yet a Curate ſeems to lie under another diſadvantage, which makes him conſidered with Abatement.

Philal. What is that?

Philot. Why, People are apt to fancy that it is the want either of Parts or Conduct, which keeps him without a Patron.

Philal. If People think ſo, I am ſorry their Senſe and Charity is no greater; for if they examined things fairly, they would find that the being a Curate is no Argument of a Mans inſignificancy, nor any juſt blemiſh to his Reputation. For it is often the integrity and generous temper of his mind which hinders him from a better Proviſion; it is becauſe he will not flatter the Pride of ſome, nor keep pace with the Bigottry of others: becauſe he will neither court Greatneſs nor Faction, nor make himſelf popular to the diſadvantage of his Audience. Becauſe he cannot digeſt a Simoniacal Contract, nor charge through Perjury with the courage of an Evidence. In ſhort, it is his plain and impartial dealing with the People, his reſolution to preſerve the Decency of his Character, and the Innocence of his Conſcience which bars his promotion: ſo that if he was mean enough to complain, he might have the ſatisfaction to apply this Sentence of *Tully* to himſelf, *Non nos vitia ſed virtutes afflixerunt.*

Philot. What a broad *Innuendo* is here upon the beneficed Clergy?

Philal. I am glad you have given me an opportunity of explaining my ſelf. My meaning is not that thoſe who are poſſeſſed of Livings have gained them, by ſuch indirect Courſes: God forbid! I only ſay, that all Men are not ſo lucky as to have the offer of fair

Conditions, and those who have not, must be Curates if they will be honest; or else lay by the use of their Priesthood, which I am afraid is not very accountable.

Philot. I confess you have brought yourself off well enough: But now I think on't you must try to maintain the liberty of your Curate a little more convincingly. For some say there lies Prescription and Immemorial Custom against it, and then you know he is a Servant by Common Law.

Philal. Not at all: For as we are lately told by a great Lawyer, Prescription is good for nothing where there are any Records to the contrary.

Philot. What Records can you produce?

Philal. Why, to mention no more, the 18*th* of the Apostles Canons, and the 80*th* of the Council of *Eliberis*, are, I think, considerable Evidence; the first of which forbids the ordaining of those who had married a Servant, and the other excludes manumized Persons, while their Patrons were living, from the Priesthood.

Philot. Say you so? Then I fancy those who drew up Queen *Elizabeths* Injunctions knew nothing of this piece of Antiquity you mention.

Philal. Your Reason?

Philot. Because by those Injunctions a Clergy-man could not lawfully marry till he had

gone

gone and made his complaint againſt Celibacy, before two Juſtices of the Peace, and gained their conſent, and the *good will of the Maſter, or Miſtriſs where the Damſel ſerved.*

Philal. And then I ſuppoſe if he could not prevail by his Rhetorick they gave him a Warrant to diſtrein.

Philot. Or poſſibly if he courted in *forma pauperis* they aſſigned him a Wife *gratis* out of an Hoſpital.

Philal. Upon my word this Order, take it which way you will, has a ſingular aſpect, and looks as if it intended to put the Clergy in mind, that they ought not to aſpire above an *Abigail.* Certainly Diſcretion and Merit ran very low in the Church at that time, or elſe, ſome People were willing to make the Nation believe ſo. But to return to the Canons, the deſign of which was to ſecure the Reputation of the Clergy; but according to the modern opinion, this proviſion ſignifies nothing; for if a man muſt go to Service after he is in Orders, had he not as good do it before? In your ſence he often only changes his Lay for an Eccleſiaſtical Maſter, which ſometimes might be ſo far from an advantage that it would make the Servitude the more uneaſie, by being ſubjected to one no more than equal to himſelf.

Philot. I grant you in the Primitive Times the advantage of Prieſthood was equally ſha-

red among all the Order, and none of that Character had any Superiority over another. For then the Revenues of the Church conſiſted only in the voluntary Offerings of the People, which were all depoſited with the Biſhop, who aſſigned every one his reſpective portion; ſo that no Prieſt had any dependence upon another for his maintenance; but now the caſe is otherwiſe, and a man ought to be ſubject to him that ſupports him.

Philal. It's ſomewhat hard, that the bare alteration of the Church Revenues ſhould make ſo wide a difference between thoſe who were equal before; that a man muſt loſe his freedom only for want of a Preſentation, and be made a Servant becauſe he does not take Tithes, though he has as much ſpiritual Authority as if he did. But I perceive you think there is no conſideration equivalent to a little money, and that he who receives it muſt be no longer at his own diſpoſal, though he makes never ſo valuable a return. Since therefore you inſiſt ſo much upon maintenance, what if it appears that the Curate maintains the Parſon?

Philot. That would be ſtrange indeed.

Philal. To what end were the Church Revenues intended?

Philot. To keep up the worſhip of God.

Philal. Which way?

Philot.

Philot. By settling a competent maintenance upon the Ministers of Religion, that they may be in the better capacity to discharge their Office, and not be obliged to lose their time, and lessen their Character, by engaging in Labourious or Mechanical Employments.

Philal. By your arguing there should be something for them to do.

Philot. Yes, they are to take care of that Precinct to which their Endowment is annex'd.

Philal. I hope you don't mean not to come at it.

Philot. I mean they are to take care of the performance of the duties of their Office.

Philal. Then ought not he to have the Revenues who performs these Duties?

Philot. I am not willing to grant that.

Philal. Have a care of denying the conclusion; you grant the Revenues of the Church were designed for the support of the Clergy.

Philot. Yes.

Philal. Of what Clergy? Those who live many miles distant from the Premises?

Philot. No, I'm afraid they were intended for those who live upon the place, otherwise methinks Endowments are a very slender Provision for the benefit of the Parish.

Philal. Then if the Curate does all the work, ought he not to have the reward for his

his pains? In ſhort, either he is qualified to undertake the Pariſh or not; if not, with what ſincerity can he be employed? If he is qualified, why is he barred the profit when he only performs the Conditions upon which they were ſettled, when none but himſelf anſwers the deſign they were intended for? To ſpeak properly, the Rector ſeems to live out of the labours of another, he is maintained by the perquiſites of the Curates Office; and therefore is in effect but a kind of Penſioner to him.

Philot. I ſee you are an everlaſting Leveller, you won't allow any encouragement to extraordinary Induſtry and Merit.

Philal. You miſtake me. I would have the beſt men have the beſt Livings, but then before we go to doubling of Preferments, poſſibly it were not amiſs to examine whether the number of Benefices exceeds the Perſons who are capable of them. Let us firſt examine whether they will hold out one apiece, and when every man has one, then the ſupernumerary Livings may be divided amongſt thoſe who are moſt deſerving.

Philot. In good time, when it's likely there there will be none left! Now do you imagine the Church can be defended againſt her Adverſaries by the ſtrength of a ſingle Parſonage? But it may be you will ſay all our Plurality-men are not Writers.

Philal.

Philal. No, nor Readers neither. Beſides, we may obſerve that Hereſie and Schiſm were very ſucceſsfully combated before Unions, Diſpenſations, and Conſolidations were heard of. If you conſult Father *Paul*'s Hiſtory of the Council of *Trent*, (p. 216.) he will inform you that Non-reſidence and Pluralities are things of no very primitive eſtabliſhment. I confeſs ſome of the Lay-managers of our Reformation have not been over-kind to the Church, ſo that Affairs are not in ſo good a poſture as they might have been: But God be thanked there is ſtill ſome proviſion left for the Ornament and Defence of Religion.

Philot. What Proviſion do you mean?

Philal. Why, to ſpeak to your Caſe, there are Dignities, to which thoſe Gentlemen who are prepared to engage in the Controverſie have a good right: And with ſubmiſſion to better Judgments, I think it would not be amiſs if all dignified Perſons held their Preferments by a new Tenure.

Philot. What Tenure?

Philal. By Knights Service; purſuant to which they ſhould be obliged to draw their Pens in the Cauſe, when ever their Superiours required them; to appear in the Field upon an Invaſion with their *Quota*, and in ſhort, to maintain any Poſt that ſhall be aſſigned.

Philot.

Philot. What if a man has not a mind to quarrel, muſt he be turn'd out of his Dignity for being of a peaceable Diſpoſition?

Philal. Thoſe peaceable men you ſpeak of, are none of the moſt uſeful in a time of War, and therefore a ſmaller Gratification ſhould content them.

Philot. What if they are diſabled by age?

Philal. Then they ſhould be continued for their paſt Services.

Philot. Truly this is a good probable Expedient to keep the Church Militia in Diſcipline, and might for ought I know, very much improve the *noble Science of Controverſie.* But to return to the old Argument, if you intend to bring me over to your opinion of the Curate, you muſt clear the buſineſs of his Salary a little better, for I am afraid where he has his money he ought to own he has his Maſter too.

Philal. I confeſs there would be a great deal in what you ſay, if the Rector had the right of Coinage. If the Money had his Image, and Superſcription upon it, the Curate's taking it for currant, would conclude him under his Juriſdiction: but that the bare receiving a ſum ſhould ſink a Man into a ſervile ſtate, is paſt my comprehenſion. For conſidering that Mony is a thing of ſuch quality, and ſovereign ſway in the World, one would imagine it ſhould bring Power

and

and Reputation along with it, and rather enlarge than abridge a Man's Liberty by receiving it. And to mention nothing farther, the nature of the Contract between the Rector and Curate, is sufficient to give you satisfaction; for there, as has been observed, the Curate undertakes no other Employment but the Instruction and Government of the Parish. There is no attendance upon the Parson, no running upon his Errands, nor subjection to his Humour indented for.

Philot. Methinks it is a little hard a Curate must not be called a Servant, as well as a Cook, or a Footman, since he has Wages as much as the other.

Philal. Possibly not always so much neither; but waving that, if you had remembred what I urged to you before, this Objection would have been no difficulty.

Philot. What was that?

Philal. Why, that the Curate is to wait upon none but God Almighty, that the manage of his Employment is not prescribed by the Rector, but by the Rubrick and Constitutions of the Church, and that he is not removeable at pleasure. I suppose by this time you apprehend there is a difference between him and a Footman, or a Steward either.

Philot. Well! Notwithstanding your subtlety, this notion of Wages sticks in my Stomach still.

Philal.

Philal. I wonder the glitter of a little Mony ſhould dazle your Eyes at that rate, that you cannot ſee ſo plain a diſtinction. You don't ſeem to underſtand Commerce, if you think that ſomething of Authority and Dominion is always given in exchange for Mony. Now I am of *Diogenes* his mind, and believe it poſſible for one to buy a Maſter, as well as a Servant.

Philot. As how?

Philal. Why, for the purpoſe, if a perſon of twenty one puts himſelf Apprentice to another, you know this is ſeldom done without charge: now what does a Man do in this caſe but purchaſe his ſubjection, and hire himſelf a drubbing upon occaſion? To give one inſtance more. When a Woman of Fortune marries a Man with nothing, does ſhe not give him Meat, Drink, and Wages to govern her? And to end this diſpute, you know Phyſicians, and Lawyers, and Judges, have Fees or Wages, either given, or aſſigned them by Law, without being thought Servants to thoſe they are concerned with. Now, what reaſon is there a Curate ſhould have worſe luck with his Mony than other People?

Philot. To deal plainly, I ſuppoſe it is becauſe he does not get enough of it. If his Fees were as conſiderable as any of thoſe Gentlemen you ſpeak of, I queſtion not but his Office would be much more repurable.

Philal.

Philal. Well guessed, and therefore what Character do they deserve who confine him to this scandalous Pittance. I believe you can scarcely name any sort of Injustice which has a more malignant influence upon Religion than this oppression of Curates.

Philot. Why so Tragical?

Philal. Because their Poverty exposes them to Contempt, which renders their Instructions insignificant, and which is worse, makes them less considerable in themselves, as well as in the opinion of others.

Philot. I hope Poverty is no crime.

Philal. No, but it's a scurvy temptation, especially to those who have lived freely, and been bred to better Expectations. For when a man finds his hopes disappointed, himself unsupported, and topp'd upon by Persons of meaner Pretences and Employments; this is apt to pall his Spirits, and check the courage of his thoughts, so that his Compositions and Fortune will seem to be much of a piece.

Philot. I thought strait circumstances had been none of the worst promoters of Learning, according to the old saying, *Ingenii largitor Venter.*

Philal. I grant there is some truth in your observation, and that it is Want which often reconciles men to Labour and Letters; but this is at their first setting out, when though they

they have not gained their point, yet they are full of hopes, which pricks them on, and puts them upon their utmoſt. but after they are once qualified for ſucceſs, and find their induſtry diſcouraged, this makes them ſink in the ſocket, and fret away their ſtrength and Spirits; ſo that either out of impotence, or diſguſt, or diſpair, they give over the fruitleſs purſuit, and ſeldom make any generous attempt ever after. 'Tis true, there are ſome hardy ſouls that won't be beaten off by ill uſage, but theſe are very rarely to be met with.

Philot. Then you think there would be a ſtrange improvement in the unbeneficed Clergy, if they had a better Salary.

Philal. Yes; I think they would have more Books, and more Learning, and more Credit. They would not be ſo eaſily obliged to improper Compliances, nor ſo liable to ſeveral other miſcarriages in their Conduct.

Philot. By your diſcourſe the ſlender proviſion which is made for them, ſhould be very Criminal.

Philal. Doubtleſs ſo it is. For pray conſider.

Philot. Pray be as brief as you can.

Philal. I ſay then, for a Clergy man to enrich himſelf by the labour and neceſſities of one of his own Order, and make his Figure out of the Church without performing the Ser-

vices

vices required, is a direct tranſlating the holy Revenues to a Foreign and ſecular uſe, and conſequently beſides other aggravations is no better than ſacrilege, which is a very uncanonical Sin, and unleſs we are very much in the dark will be accounted for afterwards. In ſhort this Practice has been the main ground of the Contempt of the Clergy, making one part of them grow cheap by their Poverty, and the other by their Covetouſneſs.

Philot. Pray what allowance would you oblige the Rector to, if you had the Regulation of that Affair?

Philal. To ſpeak within Compaſs, in my Opinion the Curate ought to have half the profits, let the value of them be never ſo conſiderable; for if the Parſon has the other moiety for doing nothing, I think he has no reaſon to complain. But if the Living be ſmall, then he that ſupplies it ſhould have two thirds aſſigned him, becauſe he cannot be decently ſupported under that proportion.

Philot. Well, I am not diſpoſed to examin that matter any farther. But I beſeech you what is all this to the buſineſs of Pride? I think your Zeal for the Curates has tranſported you a little out of your Subject.

Philal. No ſuch matter; for it is generally nothing but Ambition which makes Men Covetous and Mean: beſides, if it is a Digreſſion it is a very ſeaſonable one. However

I am willing to take my leave of this part of the Argument, therefore if you pleaſe we will call a new Cauſe.

Philot. I think it is beſt to adjourn at preſent, and when we meet again I will venture the other Bruſh with you.

Philal. Till then Farewel.

A SECOND CONFERENCE BETWEEN *Philotimus* and *Philalethes*.

Philal. WELL met! I am glad the opportunity you mentioned is ſo quickly returned.

Philot. So am I, and therefore if you pleaſe without any further Ceremony, let us purſue the Argument we were laſt upon.

Philal. With all my Heart, and ſince (as has been ſhewed) Learning and Conceit, make ſo odd a Figure; let us proceed to examine the pretences of Nobility, for I am afraid the Vulgar Notion of it is ſcrewed ſomewhat too high, and that it has not Ballaſt enough to carry all the Sail which is commonly made out.

Philot. I muſt tell you, you are upon a touchy Point, and therefore I hope you will treat ſo nice a ſubject as this is with proportionable caution.

Philal. I am ſenſible of what you ſay, and ſhall manage my enquiry with all the fairneſs, and decency, the free diſcuſſion of the Queſtion will allow. To begin, you know all Men were equally Noble, or if you will, equally Plebeian at firſt: now I would gladly underſtand how they came to be ſo much diſtinguiſhed afterwards, for there are different reaſons aſſigned.

Philot. I ſuppoſe the diſtinctions you mention, were founded upon extraordinary performances, and won at the expence of Induſtry and Merit. For how can you imagine any perſons ſhould emerge out of the common Maſs of Mankind, unleſs by the advantages of Capacity, Labour, and Reſolution? Their mounting, argues that Fire was the ruling Element in their Compoſition; and that they were of a more vigorous and enterprizing Spirit than their Neighbours.

Philal. I am willing to ſuppoſe with you, that they made a generous uſe of theſe advantages, and employed them for the benefit of Mankind: being as remarkable for their Juſtice, Fidelity, and good Humour, as for their Conduct and Courage; and therefore I am not willing to believe the account which ſome pretend to give concerning the Original of Nobility.

Philot. What is that?

Philal. They will tell you that it has been often founded upon Rapine and Injuſtice. It ſeems they have obſerved out of *Thucidides*, that in antient times it was counted an Heroick Atcheivement to Plunder luſtily, and he was a Man of the beſt Quality, who was able to ſteal moſt Cattle. Theſe *Nimrods* (ſay they) grew great by the ſtrength of their Limbs and their Vices, engraved their Murthers upon their Shields, and Hectored all the little and peaceable People into Peaſantry.

Philot. This looks ſo like a Chimerical and ill natur'd Opinion, that I ſhall not do it the honor of a Confutation.

Philal. I have no exceptions to your Reſentment, but to go on, for the more diſtinct conſideration of the Argument, we will divide Nobility into two kinds, Hereditary, or Acquired. The firſt is tranſmitted to us from our Anceſtors, the other is immediately conferred by the favour of the Prince.

Philot. Proceed upon the ſeveral parts of your Diviſion.

Philal. 1. Then, Hereditary Nobility ſeems no juſt ground for a high Opinion, becauſe it is borrowed. Thoſe great Actions which we had no ſhare in, cannot properly be any part of our Commendation, eſpecially if we want abilities to imitate them. 'Tis true, they ought to be taken notice of by others for the encouragement of Vertue, and the ornament

of Society. But then he that depends wholly upon the worth of others, ought to conſider that he has but the honor of an Image, and is worſhiped not for his own ſake, but upon the account of what he repreſents. To be plain, it is a ſign a Man is very poor when he has nothing of his own to appear in; but is forced to patch up his Figure with the Relicks of the Dead, and rifle Tomb-Stones and Monuments for Reputation.

Philot. Notwithſtanding your rallying, I cannot conceive what crime it is to poſſeſs the Inheritance of our Forefathers. Now Honor is part of their Eſtate, which was raiſed on purpoſe that we might be the better for it. And ſince their Children were the occaſion of their merit, and puſhed them on to generous undertakings, ought they not to ſhare in the glory of the Succeſs?

Philal. Yes. But it ſhould be managed with great modeſty, becauſe though an honourable Title may be conveyed to Poſterity, yet the ennobling Qualities which are the Soul of Greatneſs, are a ſort of incommunicable perfections, and cannot be transferred. Indeed if a Man could bequeath his Virtues by Will, and ſettle his Senſe, and Learning, and Reſolution, upon his Children, as certainly as he can his Lands, a brave Anceſtor would be a mighty privilege.

Philot.

Philot. I hope thoſe fine Qualities are not ſo incommunicable as you ſuppoſe, for methinks there is a *Je ne ſcay quoi*, in perſons well born: there is a peculiar Nobleneſs of Temper in them, their Converſation is inimitably graceful, and a Man may diſtinguiſh their Quality by the Air of their Faces.

Philal. I wiſh that Spirit of Honor and Bravery you mention, was inſeparable to their Quality; but it is too plain that great Minds, and great Fortunes don't always go together; however I grant there is ſome Truth in your obſervation, but am afraid the diſtinction does not always ſpring from the cauſe you aſſign. For by the gracefulneſs of Converſation, I ſuppoſe you mean a decent Aſſurance, and an Addreſs in the Modes, and Geſtures of Salutation. Now theſe are pretty accompliſhments I confeſs, and recommend a Man to Company with ſome advantage; but then they are eaſily gained by Cuſtom and Education, and therefore we need not fetch them *ex Traduce*. And moreover, theſe little Formalities are often magnified beyond all Senſe and Reaſon, and ſome People are ſo Fantaſtically fond of them, as if they were the topper perfections of Human Nature; and that it were in reality a more valuable and gentile quality to Dreſs well, and come handſomely into a Room, than to take a Town, or to be fit to diſcharge the Office of a Privy Coun-

ſellor. Now with ſubmiſſion to theſe Ceremonious Gentlemen, I am not of their mind in this matter, but think it much better for a Mans Parts to lie in his Head, than in his Heels.

Philot. I think ſo too, but you have not anſwered the whole.

Philal. True! Your Air was omitted: now if this was a conſtant privilege of Birth, which you know it is not, yet in this deceitful Age of ours, there is no Arguing from an Outſide. Beſides, I doubt this Advantage is ſometimes the effect of a ſlothful and Effeminate Life. When Men will attempt nothing either in the Field, or in their Cloſets: when they will neither trouble themſelves with Thinking, nor endure to be expoſed to the Weather: This Niceneſs, though it renders them inſignificant to the great purpoſes of Life, yet it Poliſhes their Complexion, and makes their Spirits ſeem more moving and tranſparent. Sometime this Sprightlineſs and Grandeur of Face, is Painted by Flattery: for when Men are once made to believe they are very Conſiderable, they are preſently for trying to write the Inſcriptions of their Quality upon their Forehead. Now Conceit when it is Corrected with a mixture of Gravity, is an admirable *Waſh*, and will make one look as Wiſe, and as Great as you would wiſh.

Philot,

Philot. This Grandeur of Face, as you call it, may poſſibly be explained upon kinder Principles; for I am apt to believe that a quick Senſe of Honour, a Conſciouſneſs of Worth, an Elevation of Thought, will ſometimes break out into a Luſtre, and make the great Soul ſparkle in a Man's Eyes.

Philal. I cannot deny what you ſay, and therefore the beſt Conſtruction ought to be made, where the known Character of the perſon does not diſallow it.

Philot, I ſee you can be fair when you liſt, therefore I ſhall venture to go on with you to another Advantage of Nobility, *viz.* Antiquity. Now to begin in your own way, Don't you think it is a great addition to ones Birth to ſtand at the bottom of long Parchment Pedigree, and be ſome yards removed from the firſt Eſcocheon? Is not that Family ſubſtantially Built which can ſtand the ſhock of Time, and hold out againſt all varieties of Accidents? How generous muſt that Blood be, which has been ſo long Refining, and run through the Channels of Honor for ſo many Ages, where it is ſometimes as hard to come to the Plebeian Fountain: as to find out the Head of *Nilus?*

Philal. Not ſo hard neither, For if you go but one Inch farther than the Gentleman at the Topyou ſpoke of, it is ten to one but you take old Goodman, &c. by the Leathern Breeches.

Breeches. And as for the Antiquity of a Family, though it looks prettily at firſt ſight, yet I fear it will abate upon examination.

Philot. Pray try your skill upon it, for I am not of your mind.

Philal. Then to deal plainly with you, I conceive the Antiquity you talk of, is commonly nothing but antient Wealth, and therefore the chief commendation of this Privilege conſiſts in the long continued Frugality of the Family, who after they were once poſſeſſed of an Eſtate, had the Diſcretion to keep it.

Philot. Is it nothing then for a Man's Anceſtors to have lived in Reputation, and to have had Intereſt and Command in their Country for ſo many Generations?

Philal. I ſuppoſe the *Engliſh* of all this is no more than that they have lived in good Houſes, Eat and Drank better, and born higher Offices than thoſe who have wanted a Fortune. Now Mony, and a moderate ſhare of Senſe, will furniſh any Man with all theſe Advantages. And as to the holding out againſt ſo many Accidents, and Alterations of State, I am afraid it ſometimes proceeds from ſhifting and indifferent Principles, and from a ſervile compliance with whatever is Uppermoſt. So that what my Lord *Bacon* mentions in reference to Notions and Inventions, may be ſometimes applicable to Families; where he tells us, that Time is like a River,

in

in which Metals and ſolid Subſtances are ſunk, while Chaff and Straws ſwim upon the Surface.

Secondly, You are to conſider that an antient Gentility does not neceſſarily convey to us any advantage either of Body or Mind: and to ſpeak like Philoſophers, theſe are the only two things in which we are capable of any real improvement. I confeſs, if every Generation grew Wiſer, Stronger, Handſomer, or longer Lived than the other: if the Breed of a Man's Family was thus improved, the farther it was continued; then indeed the quality of an Eſcocheon would be exactly contrary to that of Cloaths, and the one would always grow better, as the other does worſe, by wearing. From whence it would follow, that if the ſeven Sleepers had been made Gentlemen immediately before they entred their Cave, and had held on their Nap from ſeventy, to ſeven hundred years, they had moſt undeniably ſlept themſelves into a conſiderable degree of Quality.

Philot. You may talk as ſubtilly as you pleaſe, but you muſt not think to baffle eſtabliſhed and unconteſted Opinions, with a few Logical quirks.

Philal. Pray don't grow warm, and I will endeavour to ſatisfie you, and in order to it, I obſerve in the third place, That an antient Gentility, makes a Man Superior only to thoſe

of

of the ſame Quality, (*viz.* an Eſquire, to an Eſquire, and ſo in the reſt) and that in nothing but in point of Precedency. The reaſon, I ſuppoſe, why thoſe which are placed in any degree of Honor, precede others who are afterwards raiſed to the ſame Height, is for the encouragement of Induſtry. To make Men forward to exert their earlieſt Endeavours to deſerve well of the State; for this reaſon there is a diſtinction made between Merit, otherwiſe equal, only upon the account of the Priority of Time.

Philot. Is this all you can afford?

Philal. Look you! We that pretend to be ſubject to a Conſtitution, muſt not Carve out our own Quality, for at this rate a Cobler may make himſelf a Lord.

Philot. And what then?

Philal. Why, then I ſay, it is Vanity for any Man to have a better Opinion of his Family than the Law allows: my Reaſon is, becauſe the Law is the meaſure of Honor, as well as of all other Civil Rights. Beſides, I muſt tell you that it is both reaſonable, and the Intereſt of the State that Merit ſhould be conſidered, of what date ſoever it is. A worthy Action ought to be as much rewarded now, as one of the ſame kind was a thouſand years ſince. The proſpect of Honor, to a generous Mind, is the chief incitement to all great Undertakings. This conſi-

deration

deration Poliſhes Arts and Sciences, makes Men Induſtrious in improving their Underſtandings, and Reſolute in expoſing their Perſons, for the Publick Service. If therefore we dote upon Antiquity ſo far, as to undervalue the Merit of the preſent Age, the Government muſt neceſſarily ſuffer by it: for ſuch a Partiality will ſlacken the Nerves of Induſtry, and occaſion a negligence both in thoſe who have an antient Title to Honor, and in thoſe who have not. The firſt will grow ſluggiſh, becauſe they have a ſufficient ſhare of Reputation already; and therefore need not run any hazards about getting more. The latter will abate in their forwardneſs to oblige their Country, becauſe they know their Service, though never ſo great, will be contemned, and for that very Reaſon which ought to make them the more valued, that is, becauſe their Conſiderableneſs came from themſelves. Moreover, If the Inheritors of antient Honor, have not by Perſonal Additions improved that Stock which was granted to their Anceſtors; there is no reaſon it ſhould be rated above the ſame Degree (Precedency excepted) which is given now. For to affirm that a Family raiſed to Nobility by this King, is not as good as one raiſed by the Conqueror, is a reflection upon his preſent Majeſty: it ſuppoſes his Judgment, or his Authority, leſs conſiderable than that of his

his Predeceſſours; and that the Fountain of Honour is almoſt dry'd up, and runs more muddy than in former Ages.

Philot, How plauſibly ſoever you may make your opinion look, I'm ſure it has the diſadvantage of being Singular. For you know a plain Gentleman of an ancient Family is accounted a Perſon of better Quality than a new made Knight, though the reaſon of his dubbing was never ſo Meritorious. Honour like *China* Diſhes muſt lie ſome Ages under Ground before it comes to any Perfection. And to carry on your own Figure, the greater diſtance from the ſpring always makes the Stream the more conſiderable.

Philal. This it is to be wiſer than the Laws! And ſince you are for Illuſtrations I reply, that to ſuppoſe an ancient Title (though leſſer in degree) is preferable to a greater of late Creation, is as if one ſhould affirm that an old ſhilling is better than a new half-Crown, though the Alloy and Impreſſion are the ſame in both. Nay from your Argument a man may conclude that a coarſer metal only by being digg'd and refin'd in the Dayes of our Great Grandfathers, (though perhaps it has contracted ſome ruſt by lying) is more valuable than the ſame weight in Gold but lately ſeparated from the Oare. And that an ancient Eſtate is really better than one newly purchaſed, though the Lands

of

of the latter are richer, and the Survey larger than the other. Now if a man ſhould prove ſo fanciful as to demand a greater Rent for his Farm becauſe it has been in the Poſſeſſion of his Family for ſome hundred of years, I believe the want of Tenants would ſoon convince him of his Errour. From whence it's evident that in taking an Eſtimate of Nobility we are not ſo much to conſider its Antiquity, as the Merit of the firſt Grantee, and the diſtinction the Prince has put upon it; which like Figures or other marks upon Money, ſtamp the value, and tell the Subject for how much it is to paſs.

Philot. Pray by your favour are not Meddals, and Coyns valued more for their Antiquity than their Metal?

Philal. That Queſtion is to the point; and therefore I anſwer,

Firſt, That Coyns, *&c.* though they are valuable as rarities, yet they ſignifie little in Exchange and common uſe; And if a man has any debt to pay, or Commodities to buy, K. *Charles* his Image, and ſuperſcription will do him much more ſervice than Ce'ſar's.

Secondly, The Reaſon why theſe things are ſometimes ſo much valued, is not becauſe they are old but uſeful: They often rectifie Chronology, and explain Hiſtory, and retrieve us ſeveral material parts of Learning, which

which might otherwiſe have been irrecoverably loſt.

Thirdly, There is a diſparity in the caſe of ancient Coyns and Families; For in the firſt you have the ſame numerical peice, in the latter nothing but the Name or Relation, ſo that the change and ſucceſſion of Perſons ſeems to deſtroy the notion of Antiquity. To make the Inſtance parallel we muſt ſuppoſe a Gentleman as old as *Methuſalem*, and then I confeſs he would be a great Curioſity, and ought to be valued accordingly.

Philot. As I remember you were ſaying, the merit of the firſt Gentleman of the Houſe ought to be conſider'd.

Philal. Yes, I conceive that circumſtance very material, and that if upon enquiry it proves unintelligible, or unlucky, it's no ſmall abatement to the Family. For if he Advanced himſelf by a voluntary engaging in unjuſt Quarrels, he has no better pretence to Honour than what a reſolute and ſucceſsful Padder may Challenge. If he owes his Heraldry to a ſervile Flattery, and a dextrous Application to the vices of Princes, the marks of their Favour are rather infamous than Honourable to his Poſterity, becauſe he is ennobled for thoſe qualities, for which he ought to have been puniſhed.

Philot. What if the Gentility was purchaſed, I hope we may make the beſt of what we have paid for?

Philal.

Philal. By all means! But then this is a ſign that Worth and diſtinguiſhing Qualities were wanting, otherwiſe the Honour had been conferred Gratis. The ſame may be ſaid when *Arms* or Titles are given at the Inſtance or recommendation of a Favorite, for this is down-right begging for Quality, and looks more like an Alms than an Honour. Farther it's a leſſening to a mans Nobility, when the Reaſon and Grounds of it are unknown, for if his Riſe had been derived from worthy and creditable Cauſes, he would in all likelyhood have been as certainly acquainted with them, as with his Arms; It being both eaſie and for the Reputation of the Family, that Records of this nature ſhould have been preſerv'd, and therefore the loſs of them ſeems rather to proceed from Deſign than Neglect. In ſhort, if the firſt Principles of Honour happen to be thus coarſe, or counterfeit, it's not in the power of time to mend them: A Pebble or *Briſtol* ſtone will not change their natures, and improve into Diamonds, though they are laid up a thouſand years together.

Philot. Hark you Mr. I doubt your Effects (if you have any) have lain but a little while in the Heralds Office.

Philal. Probably as long as your Worſhips: But I take it to be much more a Gentlemanly quality to diſcover ſuch unſociable

miſtakes than to abett them. If we are capable of underſtanding any thing, it muſt undoubtedly be more creditable to promote good humour and modeſty in Converſation, and give men right Apprehenſions of themſelves; than to flatter them into groundleſs Conceits, and make them believe they may be truly Great, and yet good for nothing. To maintain ſuch indefenſible and dangerous Principles of Honour, which not only impoſe upon our Underſtandings, but emaſculate our Spirits, and ſpoyl our Temper, and tend only to the nouriſhing of Idleneſs and Pride; is in my opinion no very Heroical undertaking.

Philot. Then I find we muſt come to the Merits of the Cauſe as you call them, and examine upon what foundation the Family ſtands.

Philal. I think that is the only way to know what we have to truſt to, and how far we may inſiſt upon the advantages of Birth.

Philot. What are the uſual ſteps to Honour?

Philal. I ſuppoſe one of theſe three, Learning, Commerce or Arms. The pretences of Learning have been examined already; To which I ſhall only add, that if a Perſon whoſe mind is enlarged, and beautified with all ſorts of uſeful Knowledge, is notwithſtanding

obliged

obliged to Modeſty, and Sobriety of thought, then certainly thoſe who claim under him, and are wiſe only by Proxy, ought not to grow too big upon their Relation to the Muſes. To Proceed, Commerce is another Expedient which often diſtinguiſhes a man from the vulgar. For Trading raiſes an Eſtate, and that procures Honour, ſo that in this Caſe Wealth is the main of the merit, and that which is chiefly inſiſted on by thoſe who inherit it. But here we ought to be very cautious and meek-ſpirited, till we are aſſured of the honeſty of our Anceſtours, for *Covetouſneſs* and *Circumvention* make no good Motto for a Coat. And yet your men of Trade are too often aſſiſted in their Fortunes by theſe Qualities.

Philot. I think you are too hard upon them, and believe they may come into their Eſtates by more accountable methods, *viz.* by their Induſtry, by Underſtanding how to make uſe of all fair advantages, and by the luck of a good Acquaintance.

Philal. I grant there is a great deal of Good Faith, Frankneſs and Generoſity to be found among Tradeſmen, and that ſuch Profeſſions are neceſſary to the convenience and ſplendor of Life, and being thus uſeful ought to be eſteemed Honourable. But their being uſed to value ſmall gains is apt (without care) to make them contract a narrow-

neſs of Spirit, and to ſtand too much to the point of Intereſt.

Philot. What is that which they call the Myſtery of Trade?

Philal. A great part of it conſiſts in the skill of over-reaching their Cuſtomers, which Science, I fear is not learned meerly for Speculation.

Philot. Poſſibly it may be for Caution, that they may not be impoſed on by others.

Philal. I am willing to think ſo, however theſe *Arcana Officinæ*, are counted ſuch Eſſentials, that except an Apprentice is fully inſtructed how to Adulterate, and Varniſh, and give you the Go-by upon occaſion, his Maſter may be charged with Neglect, and ſued for not teaching him his Art, and his Trade.

Philot. It ſeems then he cannot be an Honeſt Man, except he teaches his Servant to play the Knave.

Philal. Granting your Inference, yet you know a Man may underſtand his Weapon better than his Neighbour, and notwithſtanding be of a very peaceable inoffenſive Temper. However, when the Riſe of the Family is owing to ſuch an Original, a Man has a particular Reaſon not to flouriſh too much upon the glitter of his Fortune, for fear there ſhould be too much Alloy in it. For ſome People are forced to climb in a very mean and ſervile poſture. They muſt Flatter, Deceive, and

Pinch;

Pinch; uſe their Neighbours, and themſelves too, very unkindly, before they can gain their Point. So that if the Anceſtour had not been remarkably Little, his Poſterity had never been reputed Great.

Philot. But what needs all this Scruple? Why ſhould I enquire ſo anxiouſly how my Anceſtors came by their Eſtate? Let their Merit be as ſmall as you pleaſe, the Revenue will not ſink upon this Score. Now, if you conſidered the Sovereignty of Mony, how it commands Honor, and Beauty, and Power, how much of Ornament, and Defence, and Pleaſure there is in it; you would allow us to be a little Uppiſh upon the Matter: for when a Man has ſuch a Univerſal Inſtrument of Delight, and is Maſter of that, which is Maſter of every thing elſe, he ought viſibly to Congratulate his Happineſs, and pay himſelf a particular Reſpect.

Philal. If I could purchaſe a parcel of new Senſes, and ſome pretty undiſcovered Curioſities to pleaſe them with, I confeſs I ſhould be more deſirous of growing Rich than I am.

Philot. What though you cannot buy any new, you may pleaſe the old ones better, and make one Senſe go as far as two, with Poverty.

Philal. I am not altogether of your mind; beſides if my Underſtanding does not improve proportionably, I am only in the fairer way to be more a Brute.

Philot. Underſtanding! Mony will buy good Books, and though the Owner ſhould ſhould not know how to uſe them, yet if has an Eſtate, he will never want People to make him believe he has Senſe, which will be in a manner as well, for Pleaſure conſiſts moſtly in Fancy.

Phila. I don't envy ſuch a one the entertainment of his Imagination, though I believe it is much ſhort of the tranſports of Lunacy: but withal I think that folly and madneſs are no proper Judges to pronounce upon the Advancements of human Nature. But to return to the Argument, no perſon can be Great by being Owner of thoſe things which wiſe Men have always counted it a piece of greatneſs to deſpiſe. To which I muſt add, that it is not the poſſeſſing, but the right management of any valuable Advantage which makes us Conſiderable. He that does not employ his Fortune generouſly, is not to be reſpected merely becauſe he has it. Indeed if a Man gives me part of his Eſtate, I am bound to make him an acknowledgment; but I am not obliged to honor him becauſe he is pleaſed to keep it to himſelf.

Philot. Well! Since Merchandize is ſometimes liable to exceptions, and antient Wealth has no right to challenge Worſhip, and Homage. Pray what do you think of Nobility raiſed by Arms? I hope here you will

grant

grant the Materials are all ſhining, and ſolid. And when an Anceſtour works out his Fortune by great and hazardous Undertakings, by contempt of Danger and Death, and all the inſtances of an Heroick Gallantry; is it not highly reaſonable his Deſcendants ſhould ſhare his Honor, as well as his Inheritance? Nay, they ſeem obliged, in juſtice to his Memory, to have ſome ſtroaks of Greatneſs and Reſerve in their Carriage. They might better be Profuſe in their Expences, than their Familiarities. The waſting his Eſtate, and razing him out of the Heralds Books, is ſcarce more injurious to his Name, than the heedleſs Condeſcenſions of his Family. For by ſuch ill managed Humility, they do as it were Proſtitute his Quality, mingle his Aſhes with ignoble Duſt, And deface the Monuments and Diſtinctions of his Merit.

Philal. I confeſs a Man ought to be civil to his Generation, but not to that degree as to plague the Living, only in Ceremony to the Dead. And I may ſay farther, that a Noble Anceſtor, does not deſire his Poſterity ſhould pretend to honor him this way, except his Qualities, as well as his Name deſcend upon them. A perſon truly Great, is never fond and unreaſonable; he hates to ſee Folly Idolized, though it be in his own Children; and had rather have his Memory buried in

Oblivion, than his Honor ſhould be Uſurped by a Degenerate inſignificant Off-ſpring. Beſides, the reaſons you aſſign why Martial Men ought to be valued by after-Ages, ſeem to be common to other pretences to Nobility.

Philot. I am ſorry if they appear ſo, ſince I deſigned them chiefly for the advantage of Arms. For in my judgment, the Profeſſion of a Soldier has a particular, and paramount Title to Honor. For can there be a more extraordinary inſtance of Greatneſs, than for a Man to be undiſmayed amidſt ſo many horrible Inſtruments and Images of Death? To expoſe his perſon as freely as if he knew himſelf immortal, and to fear nothing but Obſcurity and Diſgrace? And therefore though there are many other creditable Employments and Accompliſhments, yet there is a tranſcendent, and almoſt an aſtoniſhing Greatneſs and Graceſulneſs in Valour. It has ſomething more illuſtrious and ſparkling, more Noble and Majeſtick than the reſt.

Philal. Hold! You are going to deſcribe *Alexander* or *Ceſar*; do you think that every *Field*, or *Charge* in *Gules*, can pretend to all theſe fine things? This muſt be examined farther by and by: at preſent I ſhall only obſerve to you, that though I have a great eſteem for a Gentleman of the Sword, and don't in the leaſt intend to leſſen the juſt Character of Military Glory; yet I conceive there is another Profeſſion,

feſſion, which poſſibly does not glitter altogether ſo much upon the Senſe, but for all that, if you touch it 'twill prove right Sterling.

Philot. What Profeſſion do you mean?

Philal. That of Learning; therefore if you pleaſe, I will juſt glance upon the Advantages of Learning without interpoſing my judgment by way of compariſon.

Philot. Do ſo, for I think you had need ſay ſome kind things upon this Argument, to make amends for the freedom you took with it in our former Conference.

Philal. Don't miſtake me, I am conſcious of no Injury, and therefore deſign nothing by way of Reparation.

Philot. Take your Courſe.

Philal. 1. Then not to mention that Learning is an improvement of our Minds, which is the nobleſt part of us. I ſay not to mention this, you may pleaſe to take notice, that without ſome ſhare in this accompliſhment, War it ſelf cannot be ſucceſsfully managed. Without the aſſiſtance of Letters, a Man can never be qualified for any conſiderable Poſt in the Camp. For Courage and Corporal Force, unleſs joyned with Conduct, and reach of Thought (which are the uſual effects of Contemplation) is no more fit to command than a Tempeſt; doing for the moſt part more harm than good, and deſtroying it ſelf by its blind and ill directed motion.

It's

It is Learning which teaches a General the ſucceſſes and events of Action in former Ages, which makes him better able to judge of his preſent preparation. It inſtructs him how to take advantage of his Enemies, and avoid thoſe miſcarriages which have been fatal to others before him. It teaches him how to Fortifie and Aſſault, how to manage the difference of Ground and Weather. It lets him into the knowledge of Human Nature, and ſhews him how to underſtand the Tempers of other men, and to govern his own. It diſcovers by what ſecret Springs the Paſſions are moved, what are the moſt probable Cauſes of Hope and Fear, of Reſolution and Cowardiſe; and how ſtrangely they are mixed, and varied according to the difference of Climates, Governments, Conditions, and Occupations, eſpecially according to the different Age, Temper, Intereſt, and Experience of thoſe who are in Power.

Philot. Yes, no doubt it teaches a Man to take a Soul in pieces, as eaſily as a Watch! If ever I heard ſuch Conjuring!

Philal. Pray be not ſo ſharp, the Diſcourſe is not ſo Romantick as you ſuppoſe.

Philot. Go on.

Philal. Secondly, I obſerve that the Advantages of Learning are more laſting and extenſive than thoſe of Arms. The Courage of a Soldier, does his Country not much

ſervice

ſervice after his death, the benefit of it being uſually confined to one Age: whereas by the knowledge of Men and Things, Publick Proviſions for Society are framed, and the Conſtitution adjuſted to the Temper, and Convenience of the People; of the happy effects of which, remote Poſterity is often ſenſible. And as the Conſequences of Valour, ſeldom reach beyond the death of him who ſhewed it, ſo there are few the better for it, except thoſe a Man engages for; which are commonly none but his Countrymen. But Learning, by inventing and improving Arts and Sciences, ſcatters its Favours in a much larger compaſs; becomes a univerſal Benefactor, and obliges mankind in its moſt comprehenſive Latitude of Place and Time.

Philot. I hope you will grant that Learning muſt fly to the Protection of the Sword to ſecure its quiet, and all the profits accrewing from thence. For in earneſt, Notions, and Syllogiſms, are very defenceleſs things againſt Violence. If we had nothing but Philoſophy, Statutes and Reports, to ſecure the Peace; our *Meum* and *Tuum* were but in an ill condition.

Philal. I agree with you, and ſhall juſt add in the third place, That the ſucceſſes of Learning are naturally of a very innocent Tendency, and under good management prejudicial to none. The Conqueſts of Arts are not like thoſe

thoſe of Arms, gained by ſlaughter, and attended with ruin and deſolation. No, Here is nothing routed but Ignorance and Error, nothing deſtroyed but obſtinate Humour, and ſavage Diſpoſition:

Emollit mores nec ſinit eſſe feros.

But a Martial Man, except he has been ſweetned, and poliſhed by a Lettered Education, is apt to have a tincture of ſowerneſs, and incomplyance in his Behaviour. And therefore if you obſerve your old Heroes in *Homer*, (for want of being Book-Learned) were none of the Gentileſt Men. What a rugged tempeſtuous, unconverſable Mortal was *Achilles*; I could never fancy that ſame πόδας ὠκὺς.

Philot. Well! I perceive it is requiſite for a Man to get ſome Senſe to his Courage if he can: but have we not loſt all our Pride, and gone ſomewhat off from the Point?

Philal. No, We have only fetched a Compaſs, and thrown our reaſoning more into a Circle to inveſt the Place; and now we will come on directly, and make a little Aſſault, only to try the ſtrength of the Garriſon.

Philot. Very Soldier-like! In plain *Engliſh* I doubt you are attempting to ſhew that it is not ſo much the Profeſſion of Arms, as the unexceptionable management of that Profeſſion which makes a Family honourable.

Philal.

Philal. Yes. Therefore before we fall too much in love with the Buff in the Wardrobe; we ſhould examin whether the War was juſt, whether our Anceſtor fought in defence of his Prince and Country, or let himſelf out to any perſon who would hire him to murther. We ſhould conſider whether the Enterprize was Great and Dangerous; whether the Advantages were gained by open Bravery and Reſolution, or were no more than the effects of Chance, of Treachery, or Surprize. And though a Man can give a creditable Anſwer to all theſe Queſtions, he ſhould then remember there are a great many perſons who have ventured as far as himſelf, and yet continue in their firſt Obſcurity: ſo that had it not been his good Fortune to have fallen under the Notice of his General, his Merit had been unrewarded. There are many perſons who perform ſignal ſervice in a Breach, or Scalado, and yet their Courage is often unregarded, and loſt in the Crowd, and Tumult of the Action, ſo that they get nothing but Blows for their Pains. To wind up this part of the Diſcourſe: let the Riſe of the Family be never ſo conſiderable (I mean none but Subjects) it ought not to ſuperſede the Induſtry, or ſtop the Progreſs of thoſe who are thence Deſcended. For if we rely wholly upon the Merit of others, and are Great only by imputation, we ſhall be eſteemed by none but

but the injudicious part of the World. To ſpeak out, if neither the advantages of Fortune and Education (which often concur in theſe Caſes) the expectation of others, nor the Memory of worthy Anceſtors, if none of theſe Motives can prevail with a Man to furniſh himſelf with Supravulgar and Noble Qualities, this is an argument that he is either under a natural incapacity, or elſe has abandoned himſelf to Sloth, and Luxury. And without diſpute he is moſt emphatically mean, who is ſo under the greateſt advantages and arguments to the contrary. So that the Luſtre of his Family ſerves only to ſet off his own Degeneracy, it does *Facem præferre pudendis* and makes him the more remarkably Contemptible.

Philot. You are ſmart upon the empty Sparks! And I perceive by your diſcourſe that if we intend to ſet up ſtrong, we muſt do ſomething for our ſelves.

Philal. Yes: And therefore I preſume that Women have more reaſon to inſiſt upon their Birth than Men: becauſe they have not ſo fair a trial to diſcover their worth. They are by cuſtom made incapable of thoſe employments by which Honour is uſually gain'd. They are ſhut out from the Pulpit and Barr, from Embaſſies, and State Negotiations, ſo that notwithſtanding (as I believe it often happens) their Inclinations are generous, and

their

their Abilities great, to ſerve the publick; yet they have not an opportunity of ſhewing it.

Philot. Truly I think you need not have been ſo liberal to the *Beau-Sex*; you know they have enough to be proud of beſides Heraldry.

Philal. What do you mean?

Philot. Their Beauty Man.

Philal. Right, I believe that may diſturb them ſometimes; but they have no great reaſon for it. For Beauty though it's a pretty varniſh, yet it's of a frail Conſtitution, liable to abundance of Accidents, and but a ſhort lived Bleſſing at the beſt. And waving this Conſideration, it ſeems to be made chiefly for the entertainment of the lookers on. Thoſe who are ſo much admired by others, can't ſhare the pleaſure of the Company without the help of a Glaſs; for the Eyes which ſhew us other Objects cannot ſee themſelves. Nature ſeems to have laid the moſt graceful parts of our Fabrick out of our way; to prevent our vanity. For could ſome People always command a ſight of their Faces, they would *Narciſſus* like be perpetually poring upon their Handſomeneſs, and ſo be neither fit for Buſineſs, nor Company.

Philot. To my thinking you have not cleared the Point; For why may we not

inſiſt

inſiſt upon the privileges of Nature? Why ſhould a fine Woman be ſo prodigal of her Beauty, make ſtrip and waſte of her Complexion, and ſquander away her Face for nothing? There is no reaſon perſons of a leſs agreeable aſpect (except they have ſome other advantage) ſhould converſe with beauty upon a Level. For thoſe who cannot furniſh out an equal proportion towards the pleaſure of Converſation, ought to pay for their inſufficiency in Acknowledgments. Beauty without doubt was deſign'd for ſome advantage, and if ſo, certainly the Owners have the beſt right to it.

Philal. I grant it; and therefore it's allowable for them to ſet a value upon their Perſons, for the better diſpoſal of them. And farther if they have a mind to it, they may pleaſe themſelves, becauſe they are acceptable to others, which is a generous ſatisfaction: But when they grow humourſom they ſpoil all; For Pride not only raiſes a prejudice againſt their Beauty, but really leſſens it. For if you obſerve, it paints an ill-natured Air upon their Face; and fills them with ſpleen and peeviſhneſs and paſſion, which exhauſts their Spirits, and makes their blood leſs florid, ſo that their Beauty is neither ſo agreeable nor laſting as otherwiſe it would be. And if the preſent inconvenience will not cure them, they will do well to remember

ber that they muſt of neceſſity grow humble when they are old; unleſs they are ſo fanciful as to doat upon Rubbiſh and Ruins.

Philot. Pray let us take leave of the Ladies, and proceed to the other branch of your Diviſion, *viz.* to acquired Nobility. And here methinks every thing looks unexceptionable and fine upon your own Principles. For here we are beholden to none but our ſelves; we are not thrown up the Hill by anothers Arms, and made conſiderable by Diverſion, or Chancemedly; but climb the aſcent by plain Strength, and indefatigable Activity. Is it not a ſingular commendation to have our circumſtances not only large and Honourable, but Independent; and almoſt to create the privileges we enjoy? Here is no gilding of a coarſe ſubſtance, no borrowed Glory, no faint Reflection from an Anceſtour, but the Man is all bright and luminous to the Center, and ſhines and ſparkles in his own worth. He is not Great by Genealogy and ancient Title, by the Favour of Fortune and the Labours of thoſe he never help'd, but by Nature and Performances, by having Greatneſs incorporated in himſelf. Now may not a Perſon who has thus diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Merit, make uſe of the Honour which has been ſo juſtly confer'd upon him, and put the Lazy and leſs ſignificant in mind of their Defects?

Philal. If you recollect your ſelf you will find that this point concerning Acquired Nobility has been occaſionally diſcourſed already: Therefore I ſhall only add that upon ſuppoſition a Man has obliged the Publick, and is remarkable for great Abilities and a generous Uſe of them; he would do well to remember that there are others who have ventured as far, and performed as conſiderably as himſelf, whoſe Services all miſcarried as to any private Advantage, becauſe they were not ſo lucky as to act under the Notice of thoſe who were able to reward: And that many Perſons well furniſh'd for Employment and Honour, go out of the World as obſcurely as they came in; only for want of a proper opportunity to bring them into Light, and publick View.

Philot. What tho ſome People are unlucky, ought their misfortunes to be pleaded to the prejudice of Deſert in others?

Philal. No. But when a man has received ſo valuable a conſideration for his Service as Honour and Eſtate, he ought to acquieſce, and not preſs too arbitrarily for Submiſſion. He ſhould not ſet a tax upon his Converſation, and put the Company under Contribution for Reſpect. Beſides a Gentleman of the firſt *Head* has a particular reaſon to manage his Advancement obligingly: For by treating the little People roughly, he does in effect but expoſe his Anceſtours and reproach his own former Condition.

Philot.

Philot. You have ſo many fetches with you! But what do you think of Magiſtrates? In my opinion thoſe who repreſent their Prince, and are the Miniſters of Juſtice, cannot practiſe that Humility and Condeſcenſion you ſeem to admire, with any manner of Decency, or Security to the publick. For if they don't oblige their Inferiours to Diſtance, their Reputation will ſink, and the Majeſty of the Government will be leſſen'd, and then it's eaſie to gueſs what the conſequence muſt be.

Philal. I agree with you: Magiſtrates ought to aſſert their Office, and not make themſelves cheap by improper Familiarities. But their Character may be over-ſtrained. To prevent which inconvenience they may pleaſe to remember that their power was given them upon a publick account, more for the benefit of others than themſelves. They are deputed by their Prince, for the countenancing of Virtue, for the eaſe and Protection of the People, and therefore they ſhould diſcourage none who are regular and fair, they ſhould ſhew their Authority upon nothing but Inſolence and Injuſtice, Thieves and Malefactors; upon thoſe who affront the Government, or break the Peace. There is no neceſſity they ſhould bring the Air of the Bench into common Converſation, and wear their Commiſſions always upon their Faces.

To manage their Power thus ſingularly looks like a little private Deſign of ſetting up for themſelves; as if they procured their Authority to fright the Kings Liege Subjects, and to over-awe the Neighbourhood into a greater Reverence.

Philot. But if they ſhould happen to take too much upon them, are the People to ſlight them upon this account?

Philal. By no means: the Authority ought to be conſider'd let the Men be what they will. However in general I obſerve that the beſt way to ſecure Obſervance, is not to inſiſt too violently upon it. For Pride is a moſt unfortunate Vice, other Immoralities uſually gain their Point, though they loſe more another way; but a Proud man is ſo far from making himſelf Great by his haughty and contemptuous Port, that he is uſually puniſhed with Neglect for it: and that Diſdain with which he treats others, is returned more juſtly upon himſelf: which may be done without much difficulty, in regard Honor is not become a property ſo far as to have all it's Appurtenances bounded and fix'd by Law. The Circumſtantials and oftentimes the moſt pompous part of Ceremony, are arbitrary and undetermined. For we are not told either by Statute, or Common Law how many Bows a Superiour of ſuch a degree may expect from us,

us, nor how low we are to make them, nor how often the terms of Reſpect are to be uſed in our Application.

Philot. What do you mean?

Philal. I mean that it is not ſettled by Act of Parliament, how many Sirs and Madams, a Diſcourſe of ſuch a length is to be ſprinkled with; and therefore a croſs-grained Fellow, will tell you he has his Betters upon their Good Behaviour: if he likes their humour, he will be as liberal to them in acknowledgments as they pleaſe; if not, he ſhall take the freedom to hold his hand, and let them help themſelves how they can.

Philot. Well! I cannot reconcile this ſelf-denying Humour you are contending for to the Character of a Gentleman. Such an untoward management of Fortune and Honour as this is, argues either that a Man wants Senſe to underſtand his Condition, or Spirit to maintain it. To throw away the Prerogatives of our Birth, or the rewards of our Induſtry, at ſuch a careleſs Cynical rate, is a ſign of a Ruſtick inapprehenſive meanneſs, and that we have not the leaſt inclination to Greatneſs in us. For thoſe who deſire to be Great, will endeavour to excel, and thoſe who excel will be ſure to ſhew it; for the Eſſence of Greatneſs lies in Compariſon. A tall Man loſes the advantage of his Stature, unleſs he ſtands ſtreight, and overlooks his Neighbour.

Philal. Methinks you are ſomewhat out in your notion of Greatneſs.

Philot. Let us hear if you can hit it better.

Philal. To ſpeak freely, I conceive it a much more ſubſtantial and better natured thing than you have made it. Greatneſs certainly does not conſiſt in Pageantry and Show, in Pomp and Retinue; and though a perſon of Quality will make uſe of theſe things to avoid Singularity, and to put the Vulgar in mind of their obedience to Authority, yet he does not think himſelf really the bigger for them: for he knows that thoſe who have neither Honeſty nor Underſtanding, have oftentimes all this fine Furniture about them. Farther, To be Great, is not to be ſtarched, and formal, and ſupercilious, to ſwagger at our Footmen, and browbeat our Inferiours. Such a Behaviour looks as if a Man was conſcious of his own inſignificancy, and that he had nothing but Outſide, and Noiſe, and ill Humour, to make himſelf Conſiderable with. But he that is truly Noble, has far different Sentiments, and turns his Figure quite another way. He hates to abridge the Liberties, to depreſs the Spirits, or any ways to impair the ſatisfaction of his Neighbour. His Greatneſs is eaſie, obliging, and agreeable, ſo that none have any juſt cauſe to wiſh it leſs. And though he has a general kindneſs for all Men, though he deſpiſes not the meaneſt

eſt Mortal, but deſires to ſtand fair in the Opinion of the World, yet he never courts any Man's Favour at the Expence of Juſtice, nor ſtrikes in with a Popular Miſtake. No, He is ſenſible it is the part of true Magnanimity to adhere unalterably to a wiſe Choice: not to be over-run by Noiſe and Numbers, but to appear in defence of injured Right, of neglected Truth, notwithſtanding all the Cenſure and Diſadvantage they may ſometimes lie under. To conclude his Character, A Great Man is affable in his Converſe, generous in his Temper, and immoveable in what he has maturely reſolved upon. And as Proſperity does not make him haughty and imperious, ſo neither does Adverſity ſink him into meanneſs and dejection: for if ever he ſhews more ſpirit than ordinary, it is when he is ill uſed, and the World frowns upon him. In ſhort, he is equally removed from the extremes of Servility and Pride; and ſcorns either to trample upon a Worm, or ſneak to an Emperor.

Philot. In earneſt, you have deſcribed a Perſon of Honor: And I am ſo far pleaſed with the Character, that I would give all I am Maſter of to make it my own. But can we receive no other Advantages from Nobility, but what have been hinted already?

Philal. All that I can think of at preſent, are theſe following.

First, It gives a fair occaſion to excite the generoſity of our Minds, and diſpoſes us to the imitation of great Examples, that ſo we may not ſeem unworthy our Predeceſſours. Indeed, a Man is bound in juſtice not to impair the Reputation, nor ſpoil the Breed of the Family: but to hand down the Line to his Poſterity, at leaſt with the ſame good Conditions he received it.

Secondly, Theſe Privileges of Birth may ſerve to check an inſolent Humour in others, who behave themſelves contemptuouſly towards us upon leſſer, or but equal pretences.

Thirdly, A Man may make ſome Advantage this way, when he falls undeſervedly under Publick Diſgrace, or is unrighteouſly Oppreſſed. For in ſuch a Caſe, the mention of his Anceſtours ſeems free from all ſuſpicion of Vanity, and may fairly be interpreted to proceed either from ſelf-Defence, or greatneſs of Spirit.

Fourthly, The ſame may be done when any Office or Promotion, may Legally be claimed by vertue of an honourable Condition. For example, If a Man ſhould put in to be one of the Knights of *Malta*, he might modeſtly enough publiſh his Pedigree, and prove his ſix Deſcents, againſt a leſs qualified Competitor.

Philot. If you are at a ſtop, I think I can carry your conceſſions ſomewhat farther. For, as

as I remember, it has been granted already, that the common People may pay a Reſpect to Quality, though you mortifie the Pleaſure a little ſeverely in thoſe who receive it.

Philal. May pay a Reſpect, call you it? I ſay they muſt. For not to mention that Gentlemen have generally a greater ſhare of Fortune and Senſe too, than thoſe of vulgar Condition; not to mention this I ſay, if they had nothing to plead but their Quality, they ought to be regarded upon that Score, becauſe the State ſets a value upon it, and that for publick and conſiderable Reaſons.

Philot. I perceive if a Man will but ſtay and hear you out, you are civil enough at the laſt. Pray what are we to do next?

Philal. Why, now I could run a Diſcourſe with you upon the inconveniences of Pride: and ſhew you in particular, what an unconquerable Averſion it gives all Mankind againſt us, when we are overgrown with it. How it multiplies, and conceals our Defects from us, and makes us do a thouſand ſilly things, without taking notice of them. How it makes us a Prey to Flatterers, and puts us to great Expences only to be laughed at. I might debate with you, how it ſpoils Converſation, and takes away the pleaſure of Society. How often Families, Kingdoms, and Churches are embroiled, and the World turned topſiturvy by this Vice. Theſe and many other ill conſequences

ſequences of Pride might be enlarged upon; but this part of the Argument is, I conceive, more proper for Divines, and therefore I ſhall purſue it no farther.

Philot. Well moved! For now I think it is almoſt time to give over.

Philal. I won't tire you.

Your humble Servant.

THE

THE CONTENTS.

Some miſtakes concerning Converſation removed Page 3

The Grounds of Pride enquired into, and ſhewn to be founded in Self-Love, and why p. 5

The due bounds of Self-Love briefly examined p. 6, 7

Pride deſcribed, 1. *By way of Negation* p. 8

2. *The Poſitive marks of it are laid down* p. 13

The principal pretences to this Vice, viz. *Learning, Nobility, Wealth, Power, and Beauty* p. 17

The pretences of Learning conſidered p. 18

The Office of Curates generally miſunderſtood; the miſtakes about it rectified p. 31

The depreſſing their Character, and ſtreitning them in point of Maintenance, of ill Conſequence to Religion p. 35

The caſe of Nobility conſidered p. 51

Nobility divided into Hereditary or Acquired p. 53

The Privileges of Antiquity examined p. 57

Families generally raiſed either by Commerce, Arms, or Learning p. 66

The

The pretences of Commerce inquired into, where likewiſe thoſe of Wealth, are occaſionally handled p. 66, 69
The Merit of Arms debated p. 70
The Advantages of Learning, and Arms compared p. 73
The Plea of Beauty argued, and that of Acquired Nobility p. 79
The difference between Pride and Magnanimity p. 86
The juſt Advantages of Nobility p. 88
Some of the unhappy Conſequences of Pride hinted. p. 89

THE END.

A

Moral Eſſay

CONCERNING

CLOATHS.

THE THIRD

CONFERENCE

BETWEEN

Philotimus and *Philalethes.*

A

MORAL ESSAY

Concerning

CLOATHS.

Philot. PHilalethes, I'm glad to meet you again; Where have you been this long time?

Philal. Sometimes not juſt where I would be: But now I have no reaſon to complain; for I always think my ſelf well, when I am with a Friend.

Philot. I muſt have half an hours Converſation with you before we part.

Philal. You oblige me extreamly. I was afraid your time had been preingaged to thoſe Gentlemen and Ladies you parted with at the Coach; I heard them deſire you not to ſtay long. By their Habit and Equipage they ſeem to be Perſons of Condition, and therefore you know the Appointment muſt be well remembred?

Philot. Leave that to me. But by the way, I thought you laid ſomewhat of an Accent upon their *Habit*; were they too Fine for you?

Philal. They may be ſo for themſelves for ought I know.

Philot. I perceive you are for making *Prize* of me again. I remember what mortifying Diſcoveries you made at our laſt Meeting. I wiſh you had kept your Cynical Truths to your ſelf; for I'm ſure my *Miſtakes* were much more Entertaining.

Philal. It ſeems they were Truths then.

Philot. Yes. And that's it which vexes me; for now I have much ado to keep my ſelf in my own good Opinion.

Philal. I'm ſorry you ſhould be in love with a Deluſion, eſpecially when you know it to be ſuch. Fevers and Intemperance bring a great many gay Fancies with them; and yet they are not counted any of the Bleſſings or Ornamentals of Life.

Philot. Happineſs is Happineſs; whether 'tis founded in Reaſon or Imagination, 'tis all a Caſe to me, provided I have a vigorous Sence of it. Nay, in my Judgment, thoſe which you call the Satisfactions of *Fancy*, are the better of the two. They are more at Command than the other; and ſtand in no need of a Foreign Supply. The want of

of *Tools* and *Materials*, if the Model is anſwered, is a Commendation to the Workman. To make ſo fine a *Something* out of *Nothing*, has ſome reſemblance to Creation: So that if this way has as much Pleaſure in the Effect, it ſeems to have more of Magnificence in the Cauſe.

Philal. I grant you, if a Man could be always dreaming of Paradiſe: The Dream would go a great way towards making the Thing. But alaſs! the viſionary Pleaſure will quickly diſappear. The agreeable part of the *Fit* won't laſt; therefore let us get rid of it as ſoon as may be. The longer it continues, the worſe and the weaker 'twill leave us. We may, like the *Romans*, deify a *Diſeaſe*, if we pleaſe; but if we expect any return of the Worſhip, we ſhall be Miſtaken.

Philot. I tell you I came off with Loſs the laſt Rencounter: And now by your ſurveying me from Head to Foot, I find you think I have too much of Expence and Curioſity about me; but if you expect to diſpute my Cloaths off my Back, you will be diſappointed.

Philal. I have no deſire you ſhould turn either *Adamite*, or *Quaker*; but yet I believe ſome People throw away too much Money, and Inclination, upon theſe Things.

Philot. You ſeem to forget that the Diſtinctions of Rank and Condition cannot be kept up, without ſomething Extraordinary in this kind. And unleſs this be done, Government muſt ſuffer.

Philal. For all that, *Noah* had large Dominions, and, for ought appears, kept his Subjects in good Order without any great Aſſiſtance from the *Wardrobe*.

Philot. But Princes Subjects are not ſo near of Kin to them now; and therefore not ſo eaſily Governed.

Philal. We will Diſpute no farther about Princes: Beſides, I grant the World is alter'd, and am willing to make an Allowance upon that Score.

Philot. I ſhall proceed upon your Conceſſion. And endeavour to prove in the

Firſt place, That Richneſs of Habit is not only Lawful but Convenient, for thoſe who are poſſeſſed of publick Charges; eſpecially when they execute their Office. For the People generally take their Meaſures more from the Appearance than the Reaſon of Things. Their Apprehenſions are ſo diſpoſed, that they think nothing Great but what is Pompous, and Glitters upon the Senſes. If their Governours had not ſome Advantage of them in Figure; they would be apt to overlook their Character, and forget their Diſtance.

Philal.

Philal. I have no Intention to argue againſt *Gold Chains*, *Velvet Caps*, or *Sables*, or any Thing of this Nature; but granting this Furniture may be ſomewhat of a Guard to Authority, yet no publick Perſon has any Reaſon to value himſelf upon it. For the Deſign of this Sort of State is only to comply with the Weakneſs of the Multitude. 'Tis an innocent Stratagem to deceive them into their Duty, and to awe them into a juſt Senſe of Obedience. A great Man will rather contemn this kind of Finery, than think himſelf conſiderable by it. He will rather be ſorry that his Authority needs the Support of ſo little an Artifice, and depends in any meaſure upon the uſe of ſuch Trifles. To ſtoop to the vulgar Notion of Things, and eſtabliſh ones Reputation by counterfeit Signs of Worth, muſt be an uneaſy Task to a noble Mind Beſides, we are not to think the Magiſtrate cannot ſupport his Office without Fine Cloaths. For if he is furniſh'd with general Prudence, with Abilities particular to his Buſineſs, and has a competent ſhare of Power, he needs not doubt his Influence over the People.

Philot. Pray what do you think of private Quality? I hope you don't intend to ſtrike us out of all Diſtinction, to run all Metals together, and make a Sort of *Corinthian Braſs* of us.

Philal. By no means. However, your Argument muſt abate farther upon this Head. For Quality, ſeparated from Authority, is ſufficiently maintained by *Title*, *Arms*, and *Precedency*: This is enough to keep up *Diſtinction*, and to encourage Induſtry and Merit. There is no neceſſity for Perſons, without Juriſdiction, to march always with *Colours diſplayed*. It ſeems more agreeable that they ſhould conceal, than make a needleſs Oſtentation of their Wealth. Would it not look odly in a Souldier to give in a *Hiſtory* of his Valour and Conduct in Converſation? Or for a Man of Learning to make Harangues upon his own Parts and Performances, and tell the Company how ignorant they are in reſpect of him?

Philot. That would be a little Fulſom I confeſs; But is the Caſe the ſame?

Philal. Much at one, in private Perſons. For them to appear Pompous in Equipage, or Habit, is but a vain-glorious Publiſhing their own Grandeur, a ſilent Triumphing over the Inferiority of others, and is in effect to proclaim themſelves extraordinary People. Whereas a modeſt Man, if he was ſomewhat taller than his Neighbours, would chuſe to ſhrink himſelf into the Dimenſions of the Company, and be contented rather to looſe ſomething of his own Stature,

than

than to upbraid them with the Littleneſs of theirs.

Philot. What, becauſe a Lord of a Mannour has not always a *Commiſſion*, muſt he be allowed no better Cloaths than a Cottager?

Philal. Yes. There may be ſome Difference, and yet it needs not be very Expenſive. A Gentleman's Mien and Behaviour is ſufficient to diſcover him, without any great dependance upon *Shops* and *Taylors*. After all, the beſt way of diſtinguiſhing, is by the Qualities of the Mind. Let Perſons of Condition ſtrive rather to be richer in their Diſpoſition than the Vulgar: Let them put on a better Humour, wear a finer Underſtanding, and ſhew a more ſhining Fortitude: Let them appear remarkably Juſt, Inoffenſive, and Obliging. This is the way to be nobly Popular, and gives them the Hearts, as well as the Ceremony, of their Inferiors.

Philot. How muſt they ſpend their Eſtates, they cannot Eat and Drink them all?

Philal. However, they ſeem willing enough to try their Skill; and I believe the Experiment ſucceeds ſometimes. But to your Queſtion: Was the Surpluſage of Wealth employed in charitable Uſes, and Entertainments ſoberly Hoſpitable, I conceive

ceive it would run in a more proper Chanel. Did Men lay out their Abilities in the Service of Religion, and for the promoting of Arts and Knowledge, how might they advance the Proſperity and Glory of a Nation this way? How much Wiſer, and Eaſier, and Richer, might they make their Inferiours? And as they would be more beneficial to their Country, ſo they would ſerve the Deſigns of Greatneſs much more effectually. Such a generous Uſe of Fortune, would give Luſtre to their Reputation; and make the World look with Wonder and Regard upon them. How would it raiſe a declining Intereſt to its former Height, and with what Advantage convey their Memories to Poſterity? But to return; Richneſs of Habit is not only unneceſſary to keep up the Diſtinction of Degrees, but inſufficient. For where there are no *Sumptuary Laws* to confine the Condition of Perſons, and aſcertain the *Heraldry* of the *Wardrobe*, every one has the Liberty of being as Expenſive, and Modiſh as he pleaſes. And accordingly you may obſerve that ordinary People, when they happen to abound in Money and Vanity, have their Houſes and Perſons as richly Furniſhed, as thoſe who are much their Superiours. There are other Inſtances in which methinks theſe things are a little miſplaced.

Philot.

Philot. As how?

Philal. Why, to ſee Gold and Scarlet condemn'd to *Liveries*, the Coach-box furniſh'd like the *Council Chamber*, and the Horſes wear as good *Velvet* as the *Company*, is methinks not very agreeable. This Proſtitution of Finery is enough to make it nauſeous, and to ruin its Reputation to all Intents and Purpoſes.

Philot. When you have ſaid all, A good Suit does a Man Credit, and puts People in mind of paying him a proper Reſpect. And ſince others eſteem me upon this Account, I ought to follow their Opinion. For why ſhould I think my ſelf wiſer than the *Majority* of Mankind? Singularity ſeems to have always a *Spice* of Arrogance in it.

Philal. You are wonderfully reſigned in your Underſtanding; I gueſs the Occaſion, and ſhall endeavour to diſappoint your Humility. For notwithſtanding your *Majority*, I conceive the Reaſons of things are rather to be taken by *Weight* than *Tale*: And if ſo, fine Cloaths will ſignify nothing in the Value of a Man, becauſe they are but Signs of *Wealth* at the beſt, which generally ſpeaking is no more an Argument of Worth, than of the contrary. And as Cloaths don't ſuppoſe a Man conſiderable, ſo neither can they make him ſo. This will appear if we examine

mine either the Materials of which they conſiſt, or the Art and Curioſity which is ſhewn in the Faſhioning of them. The *Matter* of which a rich Habit conſiſts, is either the Skins of Beaſts, the Entrails of Worms, the Spoils of Fiſhes, ſome ſhining Sand or Pebles, which owe their humble Original to the Dirt. And is it not a ridiculous Vanity to value our ſelves upon what we borrow from Creatures below *Reaſon* and *Life*? In ſhort, either they are a real Advantage, or not: If they are, they prove our Dependance upon inferiour Things; which ought to be a mortifying Conſideration, unleſs we can be proud of Beggary: If they are not, then to dote on them is a Sign we are ſunk beneath our proper Level; that we admire Trifles, and diſgrace the Dignity of our Nature. To ſee theſe inſignificant Ornaments valued at ſo great a Rate, and preferred to the Neceſſaries of Life, is no ſmall Diſparagement to the Underſtandings of Men, and is an Argument of the Littleneſs and Degeneracy of our Kind. One would think he that has the Liberty of looking upon the Sun and Moon for Nothing, would never purchaſe the Glimmerings of a Peble at ſo high a Price.

Philot. I find you imagine *Pearls* were made only for *Cordials*, and that *Diamonds* are

are fit for nothing but *Bartholomew-Babies* to ſparkle in. But I believe the *Jewellers* would do well enough, if they had nothing but your Philoſophy to damp their *Trade.*

Philal. That may be. But what if I can prove that the Price of them is kept up by Imagination and ill Humour, and that the very Reaſon which makes them *Dear*, ought to make them *Cheap.*

Philot. Let's hear.

Philal. You may obſerve then that moſt of theſe Ornaments owe their Value to their Scarcity. For if they were common, thoſe who moſt admire them would be ready to throw them away. *Tertullian* (*de Habit. Muliebr.*) obſerves, that ſome People bound their Malefactors in Chains of Gold. And if a Man's Crime was very Notorious, they would make him as *fine* as a *General Officer.*

Philot. I ſuppoſe they were Sir *Thomas Moor's Utopians.* A pretty Deviſe! 'Tis pity *Whitehall* was not plundered to Ornament *Newgate!*

Philal. Tertullian obſerves farther, That Diamonds and Rubies were little eſteemed by the Eaſtern Nations, where they were the Growth of the Country. So that I ſuppoſe when the *Parthian* Children, and *Milk-maids*, had worn them till they were weary,

weary, they were bought up for the *Roman* Ladies.

Now to be fond of any thing purely becauſe it is uncommon, becauſe the generality of Mankind wants it, is an ill-natured Pleaſure, and ariſes from an unbenevolent and ungenerous Temper.

Philot. Pray what do you think of the Artificial Improvement, is not a rich Dreſs an Addition to the *Wearer* upon this Account?

Philal. Not at all. 'Tis true, the Refining upon what was more imperfectly begun by Nature, the graceful Diſpoſition of the Parts, and the judicious Mixture of Colours, are Arguments of Induſtry and Ingenuity; but then this Commendation does not belong to thoſe that buy them. If the meer *Wearing* them is any ways Creditable, it is becauſe the Taylors, *&c.* are the *Fountains* of *Honour.*

Philot. I grant you thoſe People make them, but the *Suiting* them is above their Talent. None but Perſons of Condition can hit this Point. Indeed they have a great Delicacy and Exactneſs in their Fancy: They pitch upon nothing that is Tawdry and Mechanick, Staring, or ill Matched. One may know a Gentlewoman almoſt, as well by ſeeing her chuſe a Mantua, or a Ribon, as by going to *Garter*, or *Clarencieux.*

Philal.

Philal. The mixing of *Light*, and *Shade*, handſomely, looks like a Genius for *Painting*: And that is the moſt you can make of your Obſervation. To go on with you: I ſhall venture to add, That for private Perſons to expect an unuſual Obſervance upon the Account of *fine Cloaths*, argues them conſcious of their own little Worth, and that the greateſt part of their Quality comes out of the *Dreſſing Room*. Having nothing to prefer them to the Eſteem of the Judicious, they are contented to take up with the Ceremony of the Ignorant: And with a little Glitter, and Pageantry, draw the gazing, unthinking *Mobile* to admire them. Now to deſire Reſpect where we have no Juriſdiction, purely upon our own Account, is an Argument either of a weak Judgment, or weak Pretences. If we underſtood the true Grounds of Eſteem; If we were well ſtock'd with Abilities, or good Actions, to entertain us at home; we ſhould not make our ſelves ſo mean, as to let our Satisfactions depend upon the Reverences of the Ignorant, or Deſigning. Beſides, to delight in the Submiſſions of others, is a certain Sign of Pride. This ſuppoſes that we are not ſo much pleas'd with our own Station, as with looking down, and ſeeing our Neighbours as we fancy in a worſe Condition than

our

our ſelves. Whereas a generous Mind has its Happineſs encreaſed by being Communicated.

Philot. I ſuppoſe your Artillery may be almoſt ſpent by this time.

Philal. I was going to tell you, that Rich Cloaths are accounted unſuitable to old Age, which is a farther Proof of their Inſignificancy. That Age which is moſt remarkable for Wiſdom and Temper; which is particularly honoured with the Weight of Buſineſs, and Dignity of Office; and has deſervedly the greateſt Regard paid it: That Age, I ſay, chuſes to appear in a plain, unornamented Guarb. Whereas were fine Cloaths marks of true Honour; were they Ornaments great enough for a Man's Reaſon to delight in, the wiſeſt part of the World would not go without them: Eſpecially ſince the Decays of Nature give ſo fair a Plea for the Aſſiſtances of Art. There cannot be a greater Diſparagement to this ſort of Finery, than its being refuſed by that Age which ſeems to need it moſt; and if it was Conſiderable beſt deſerves it. Since Men at the Height of Diſcretion are aſhamed of theſe Additions; this is a convincing Proof that they are Childiſh and Trifling, and fitteſt for thoſe who carry more *Body* than *Soul* about them.

Philot.

Philot. Your Inference is, That there ſhould be a Reſemblance between Age and Habit; and that a Finical old Spark, can never be in the Faſhion.

Philal. Right. For old People to ſet up for Mode and Dreſſing is a nauſeous Piece of Vanity. Indeed, when we come into the World firſt, 'tis not ſo remarkable an Imprudence, if we miſplace our Eſteem, and make an indiſcreet Choiſe. 'Tis no wonder if we ſtick upon a gaudy Outſide, when we are not ſharp enough to look through it. When our Minds are unfurniſhed with Materials for Thinking, and ſcarce ſtrong enough to wield a rational Pleaſure, they are apt to divert themſelves with the Amuſements of Senſe. But when we have run through the Experience of many years, and had ſo many Opportunities of Improvement: When our Reaſon is grown up to Maturity, and we are ſuppoſed to have made our laſt Judgment upon Things: When every thing we ſay or do, ſhould have an Air of Gravity and Greatneſs in it; then to dote upon Trifles, is a ſhrewd Sign that our Minds are no leſs decay'd than our Bodies. It looks as if we were aſhamed of making any Pretences to Wiſdom, and betrays an impotent deſire of returning to the Extravagance of Youth.

Philot. After all your Strictneſs, I hope you have ſome Reſerve of Liberty for Women.

They have the Excuſes of Cuſtom, the Agreableneſs of Figure, and the Inclinations of Sex, to plead in their behalf. Beſides, I am told St. *Auguſtine* (*Ep.*245. *Tom.*2.) abates very much of the Rigour of your *Tertullian*, and ſpeaks with great Moderation upon the Point. "He thinks Fine Cloaths ought not "to be forbidden married Women, who are "obliged to pleaſe their Husbands. And if they may uſe this Expedient to *pleaſe* them when they have them; why may they not do it that they may *pleaſe* to have them? Why may not the ſame little Charm be practiſed to Begin, as well as to Entertain the *Relation*?

Philal. With all my Heart; let St. *Auguſtine*'s Indulgence paſs. But 'tis my humble Opinion they ſhould keep their Inclinations unengaged. They would do well not to dreſs their Fancy, nor wear their Finery in their Head, nor think their Afternoon Quality better than their Morning. For when a Woman is once ſmitten with her *Drapery*, Religion is commonly laid aſide; or uſed moreout of Cuſtom than Devotion. When her governing Paſſions lye this way, Charity is diſabled, and Good-nature fails, and Juſtice is overlook'd, and ſhe is loſt to all the noble Purpoſes of Life. How often are Relations

lations neglected, Tradeſmen unpaid, and Servants ſtinted to mortifying Allowances for the Support of this Vanity? How patched and ununiform does it make the Figure of ſome Families? And what a diſagreable Mixture of Poverty and Riches do we ſee ſometimes within the ſame Walls? Theſe Exceſſes make them forget the Compaſſion of their Sex, and the Duties of their Station. They Rob the Neceſſities, and Fouriſh in the Penance, and Wear that which ſhould have been the *Fleſh* and *Bloud* of their own *Retinue*.

Philot. What do you think of thoſe below the *Gentry*, ought they not to be ſomewhat Frugal, and Unpretending in their *Appearance*?

Philal. Truly I think the Taylor ſhould *take Meaſure* of their *Quality*, as well as of their Limbs. For thoſe who make their *Cloaths* much better than their Condition, do but expoſe their Diſcretion. Perſons of Quality have ſome little Colour for their Vanity: But as for others, they have nothing to ſay for themſelves. In them it looks like a Levelling Principle; like an illegal Aſpiring into a forbidden Station. It looks as if they had a mind to deſtroy the Order of Government, and to confound the Diſtinctions of Merit and Degree. In a

word, At this rate of Management, a Man looſes his Wealth, and Reputation at the ſame time, makes himſelf expenſively Ridiculous, and over-ſhoots Extravagance itſelf.

Philot. My Time is up, I muſt leave you.

Philal. Adieu.

OF

OF DUELLING.

The Fourth CONFERENCE BETWEEN *Philotimus* and *Philalethes*.

Philal. WHether ſo faſt this Morning, methinks you are ſomewhat earlier than uſual?

Philot. May be ſo. But when a Man's Occaſions are Up, and Abroad, 'tis fit he ſhould attend them.

Philal. Pray what may your Buſineſs be, for you don't uſe to break your Sleep for Trifles?

Philot. Why laſt Night Mr. *A.* and I happen'd to fall into a Miſunderſtanding over a Glaſs of Wine. At length he told me the Controverſy could not be taken up, without giving the *Satisfaction* of a *Gentleman*. My Anſwer was, That I would debate the Matter with him in his own way this Morning. And I am now going to ſettle ſome little Affairs before the time of *Meeting*.

Philal. If you deſign to make your *Will*, you are out: For to do that to any Purpoſe, a Man muſt be *ſound in Mind and Memory*, which is none of your Caſe. For the Buſineſs you are going about is ſufficient to prove you *Non Compos*.

Philot. Pray let us have no Bantring. You know me too well to imagine that a Concern of this Nature ſhould make any diſhonourable Impreſſion: However, becauſe an Accident may happen, I love to make a proper Proviſion, and leave my Diſcretion unqueſtioned.

Philal. That you will not do with me, I promiſe you; unleſs you can give a better Account of your Undertaking than is uſually done.

Philot. I am now obliged to diſpute the Matter at the Swords Point, ſo that it will be to no effect to argue it any other way: For a Man of Honour muſt keep his Word.

Philal.

Philal. Yes, no doubt on't. If he promiſes ſo ſet a Town on Fire, 'tis as much as his Eſchutcheon and Pedigree is worth to fail in the Performance. Look you; you ſeem ſenſible that you are within a Hazard: If you are a Gentleman, learn to value your ſelf. Don't ſtake your Life againſt a Nutſhel, nor run into the other World upon every *Fop*'s Errand.

Philot. I tell you I am engaged. What if I underſtood the Practice as little as you do? Since it is the Cuſtom I muſt defend my Honour: For to ſuffer under the Imputation of Cowardize, is worſe than being buried Alive. However, if you have any thing to ſay, I have an hour good to hear you.

Philal. As much a Cuſtom as you make it, 'tis not improved into Common Law: That is point blank againſt you, and *Tyes* you all up, if you kill upon the Occaſion.

Philot. 'Tis the Cuſtom of Gentlemen, and that is ſufficient for my purpoſe.

Philal. What if it was the Cuſtom to Tilt your Head againſt a Poſt, for a Mornings Exerciſe, would you venture the beating out your Brains rather than be Unfaſhionable? What if it was the Cuſtom for People of Condition to betray a *Truſt*, to forſwear a *Debt*, or forge a *Conveyance*;

would you follow the Precedent, or forfeit their good Opinion?

Philot. You ſeem to miſtake the Point. I grant you Men of Figure are too often faulty in ſome of the Inſtances you mention: But then they are not bound to it upon the Score of Reputation, which makes a Diſparity in the Caſe.

Philal. They are not; true. But ſuppoſe they were, what then? Does not this Suppoſition clearly prove, that we are not to take the Conduct of any Sort of People upon *Content*: But to examine the Reaſonableneſs of a Cuſtom before we go into it? Whatever is beneath a Man, is beneath a Gentleman; but to act without Thinking, is beneath a Man, much more againſt it.

Philot. I perceive you believe this ſort of *Satisfaction* very unaccountable.

Philal. I do ſo. And the Law is of my Opinion, which I hope is no contemptible Authority.

Philot. Hark you, we do but laugh at theſe Stories. Do you think a Parcel of ſtarched Lawyers, with a *Jury* of *Haberdaſhers*, and *Chandlers*, are proper Judges in the Caſe? Are ſuch *Pedants* and *Mechanicks* as theſe, fit to give Rules to *Men of Honour*?

Philal. I perceive you think Ignorance and Idleneſs neceſſary Qualifications of a

Gentleman; and doubt not but that you practiſe accordingly. But if Men of Honour are too great to be govern'd by the Laws, they ſhould be ſo modeſt as not to plead it for their Advantage. They ſhould throw up their Fortune, and disband from Society. Yes, and their Quality too; for this, as well as the other, is ſettled by the *Conſtitution*.

Philot. I thought *Quality* had been the ſole Privilege of Birth, or at leaſt of the Prince's Favour.

Philal. All Honour, as well as Land, is originally a Giſt from the Crown. Now *Prerogative* is a part of the Law; And though Quality and Eſtate are ſettled upon a Man and his Heirs, yet the Grant runs always with a Condition of Forfeiture in Caſe of Treaſon. And therefore the Son of an unreſtored Traytor has no Pretences to the Quality of his Anceſtors.

Philot. I know we ſay that Treaſon taints a Man's Bloud, and makes it baſer than that of a Peaſant; but I look upon this as a kind of Whimſey. For though the Government may take away my Eſtate, yet it cannot make me nothing of Kin to my Father. So that the Son of a Gentleman muſt be a Gentleman, in ſpight of Fate.

Philal. But not in ſpight of Treaſon. For in that Caſe, he is baniſhed the *Bloud*, and tranſ-

tranſplanted from the Family of his Anceſtors. His Leaſe of Heraldry is expired, his Title is extinct, and he can no more claim his former Honour, than an Eſtate which was ſold by his great Grand-father. I grant you the Relation between him and his Father continues, and that's it which deſtroys his Pretentions. The Stream of Honour is dryed up, before it reaches the Chanel of Poſterity. The Father has loſt all, and therefore can convey nothing *over*. The Son if he pleaſes may be of kin to the Treaſon, for the Infamy of that remains; but as for the Quality 'tis all wiped out, as if it had never been. And therefore though your Inſtance is true, your Inference fails; for the Son of a Traytor, is not the Son of a Gentleman. In ſhort, you muſt either allow that Quality, like other Branches of Property, ſtands upon the Baſis of Law; or elſe you unavoidably run into the Principle of Levelling. For where the Diſtinctions of Condition are not aſcertained by publick Proviſion, every one is at Liberty to rate his own, and his Neighbour's Station, as he pleaſes. Where there are no Incloſures all People may intercommon, without Preference or Ceremony. New Grounds of Honour may be ſet up, and the old ones diſclaimed; and a Taylor may make himſelf a

Lord,

Lord, and clap a Coronet upon his *Gooſe*, if he has a mind to it.

Philot. I ſuppoſe your Concluſion is, That the Notion of Honour is to be taken from the Laws and Government, and not from any private Set of People, how valuable ſoever in other Reſpects.

Philal. Right. And from thence I infer that Duelling is a very diſhonourable Practice. For when you have given the beſt proof of your ſufficiency, and *killed your Man*, you are ſeized into the Hands of *Juſtice*, treated like Aſſaſſinators, and condemned to die with Circumſtances of Ignominy. You are not *Indicted* for acquitting your ſelves like Gentlemen, but for diſturbing the publick Peace, and murthering the King's Subjects. Now the Law never loads a Man with Reproaches, nor puniſhes him thus coarſely, for doing a handſom Action.

Philot. What do you tell me of Lawyers Cant; *Murdravit, ſtragem excercuit, & practicavit*: Very pretty Stuff to diſpatch a Man of Honour with! You ſee how the Men betray their Ignorance by their Forms of Speaking. And as for the Bench, they have a thouſand Pound *per Annum* for making of Malefactors; and they muſt ſay ſomething in Defence of their Trade.

Philal. As for the *Bench*, the *Bar*, and the reſt, they are not the *Makers* but the *Miniſters*

Miniſters of Law; they are the Servants of the Government, and their Methods of Proceeding are chalked out by their Superiours. And when the Reaſon of Things is good, 'tis not material though the *Latin* proves otherwiſe. Indeed I think the Laws can't uſe you too rigorouſly, for I'm ſure you treat them with great Contempt. When Highway-men kill 'tis commonly for a Livelihood, to prevent Diſcovery, or in the heat and ſurprize of Paſſion; and when 'tis over, they ſeldom juſtify the Fact, but condemn what they have done. But your Tribe are Murtherers by *Principle*, which is ſomething worſe than *Malice prepence*, becauſe 'tis ready upon all Occaſions, and often acts without any Provocation; except the Vanity of complying with a barbarous Cuſtom. As if it was as indifferent a thing to cut a Man's Throat, or let it alone, as to wear a Broad or Narrow brim'd Hat: And that theſe little Concerns of *Bloud*, ought to be perfectly governed by the *Faſhion*. And when the Barbarity is committed, you have the Aſſurance to maintain it, and to argue for the Murther againſt Law and Goſpel. In ſhort, I think you ſtand in the greateſt defiance to Authority of all Men Living.

Philot. How ſo?

Philal. I have given you ſome of my Reaſons, and you ſhall have the reſt.

1. You

1. You ſcorn to refer your Differences to the Law, but make your ſelves your own Judges.

Philot. If the Government will not make a ſufficient Proviſion for the Honour of Gentlemen they muſt right their own Caſe, and there's an end on't.

Philal. You would do well to prefer a *Bill* againſt all Kings and Parliaments ſince the Conqueſt; and if that won't do, *challenge* the Crown, and the two Houſes at their next Meeting, to give you Satisfaction. Do you not perceive, That by thus taking the Buſineſs out of the Hands of the Government, you both reproach, and in effect renounce it at your Pleaſure. The Laws very well ſuppoſe, that People are apt to be too partial and paſſionate in their own Concerns, and therefore remit them to a publick Deciſion. Now 'tis a kind of Maxim with us, That *no Man ſhould be wiſer than the Laws.*

Philot. What would you have me complain to a Magiſtrate when a Man gives me the *Lye*, or any ſuch ſort of Affront? Theſe things won't bear an Action; and yet a Gentleman will rather dye than put them up.

Philal. By the way, a Lye was not counted ſo mortal an Affront till *Charles* the Fifth happen'd to ſay, He was no Gentleman that would

would take it. Now what has *England* to do with *Germany*? If an Emperour throws out an unweigh'd Sentence, muſt we be governed by it? Are Law and Juſtice ſuch Phantoms, that a *Spaniſh* Rhodomontade ſhould make them vaniſh? Or muſt a Foreign Prince's Humour command farther than his Legal Authority?

Philot. The Prince's Opinion is the Standard of Mode. And to be Preciſe and Singular, looks like Spleen, and Monkery, and ill Breeding. You know when *Dionyſius* of *Sicily* had a Fit of Geometry upon him, his Court took it immediately. You could ſcarce meet a Man of Quality without a pair of *Compaſſes* about him; and Viſits were moſtly ſpent about *Squares* and *Circles*. But as ſoon as the King grew weary, the Faſhion was quite laid aſide. And then as *Plutarch* obſerves, nothing was a greater *Pedant* than a Mathematician.

Philal. You lay ſo much ſtreſs upon theſe Compliances, one would think you took them for part of your *Allegiance*.

Philot. Not to follow a Prince's Opinion, is in effect to ſay he is miſtaken, which is an unhandſom Reflection.

Philal. In Things indifferent you ſay well. But where Juſtice and Conſcience are concerned, meer Complaiſance ſhould not carry it. By the extent of your Maxim, you would have

have made an admirable *Æthiopian* Courtier.

Philot. What is that?

Philal. Diodorus Siculus tells us (*Biblioth. l.* 3.) That the *Æthiopians* happened once to have a one Eyed bandy Leg'd Prince; now ſuch a Perſon would have made but an odd Figure, if care had not been taken.

Philot. Pray how did the Court behave themſelves upon this Accident?

Philal. Like Men of Honour. They made a Faſhion of their Prince's Misfortune; and immediately ſhut up one of Natures Windows, and got a ſort of *Scotch Boot* to bend their Hams in.

Philot. I think I could have imitated *Alexander*'s wry Neck, as well as the *Macedonians.* But this which you mention is a chargeable Faſhion.

Philal. However it prevailed ſo far, that a Gentleman would no more appear with ſtrait Legs, or two Eyes in his Head, than you would in a pink'd Doublet, or Boot-hoſe Tops. You ſee how far good Breeding will carry a Man, if he will but ſtick to his Principle. But to return.

Your ſaying that theſe Indignities won't *bear an Action*, is to confeſs that the Wiſdom of the Nation has thought them below Notice. And will you venture your *All* upon a Cauſe

Cauſe which would be Hiſſed out of all the Courts of *England* as ridiculous? Will you take away a Man's Life upon a Provocation for which no Government will allow you Six-penny worth of Damages? A Complaint fitter for a Boy to run to his Mother with, than to diſorder a Man. If there was but a few of you, and you ſhould talk at this Rate, you would be ſent to *B—lam*; but *Defendit numerus*, and that's the beſt of your *Plea*.

Philot. As the Caſe ſtands, he who refuſes a *Challenge* looſes the Reputation of a Gentleman; none of that Quality will keep him Company.

Philal. Lucifer's Excommunication exactly! And I perceive you dread the *Cenſure* much more than that of the Church. The beſt on't is, you are ſomewhat out in your Calculation: For there are not a few of good Extraction of another Opinion.

Philot. I ſuppoſe you mean Eccleſiaſticks. Now we have nothing to ſay to them: Their Profeſſion exempts them from a Neceſſity of Fighting.

Philal. I mean *Seculars* too. I hope the Temporal Lords and Commons are no Peaſants. And will they account any Perſon infamous for the Regularity of his Behaviour? For not breaking thoſe Laws which they either made, or approved themſelves?

At

At this Rate they muſt be a very extraordinary Aſſembly; and *Weſtminſter* altogether as great a Sight as the *Tower*. Will not the Judges and Juſtices go for Gentlemen, and do you think they will avoid a Man's Company for declining a Challenge, and yet Commit and Hang him up for ſucceeding in it? Pray don't make the governing Part of a Nation ſo extravagantly Ridiculous. There are many other grave Perſons of Worth and Blood, who would give the Cauſe againſt you: But I find none of theſe will paſs Muſter. It ſeems *Beau*'s, and *Bully*'s, and their wiſe Admirers, have ſeized the *Heralds Office*, and engroſſed all the Quality to themſelves.

Philot. When you have declaimed till you are weary, I muſt tell you that we have no ſmall Party of as much Honour and Value as any you have mentioned, who will very hardly be brought over to your Sentiment.

Philal. I hope not. 'Tis true, I know ſome People are all Quality: You would think they were made up of nothing but Title and Genealogy. If you happen to encounter a Prejudice, or croſs upon their Fancy, they are too Conſiderable to underſtand you. Theſe, I confeſs, I almoſt deſpair of, but hope their Number is not great. By the way, let me tell you your Frater-

nity take a very great Liberty in their Opinion; you make nothing to renounce the publick Senſe in Matters of the higheſt Importance: And count that a noble Atchievement, which the Laws puniſh as a Capital Offence. Now to ſet up a Notion of Honour againſt the Government, with ſuch Circumſtances as theſe, is of very dangerous Conſequence. 'Tis ſuch an Affront to the *Conſtitution*, ſuch a deliberate Contempt, ſuch an open Defiance of Authority, as nothing can be more. It makes the Laws cheap and ridiculous, the Solemnities of Juſtice a piece of Pageantry, the Bench a few Reverend Poppets, or Scharamouche's in *Scarlet*. And thus by expoſing the Adminiſtration, the very Foundations of Peace and Property are ſhaken and *ſap'd*.

Philot. Certainly you are retained by the whole Corporation of Cowards, you make ſo Tragical a Buſineſs on't!

Philal. By your favour: To have our Swords ready to execute the Orders of every paultry Paſſion; To put Murther into our Creed, and cut Throats upon profeſſed Principles, is a Tragical Buſineſs; and I believe you'll find it ſo.

Philot. Trouble not your ſelf; we value neither your Judges, nor your Juries. If we kill *fairly*, we have always Intereſt at Court to bring us off.

Philal.

Philal. You may ſet up a Science againſt the Government, and range Murthering under Diſcipline and Rule, and call it by what fine Names you pleaſe: But your Methods of Killing, and that of Highwaymen, are alike *Fair* in the Eye of Juſtice; and the ſame Rewards are aſſigned to both. As for your Friends at Court, 'Tis to be hoped that Princes in time will reſent the Breach of their Laws, and the Loſs of their Subjects, a little more heartily: That they will not encourage a Practice which inſults their Authority, and ridicules their Miniſters, and keeps up a Spirit of Barbarity throughout the Nation. Beſides, there are Things they call *Appeals*, and in that Caſe you know your *Pardon* is out of Doors.

Philot. We muſt take our Chance for that.

Philal. You are hardy Men ſome of you. If all the Subjects ſhould take the ſame Liberty, we ſhould have wild Work. You ſay the Government is defective in conſidering the Reſpects of Honour, and therefore are reſolved to be your own Carvers. What if the under Sort of People ſhould take the Hint, and practice upon it, in the Inſtance of Property? *Look ye Neighbours* (ſays a ſharp Country Fellow) *the Fine Folks have gotten away all the Land from us; for my part I want ſo many ſcore Acres to live eaſily, and*

I ſuppoſe you do ſo too, and I think our Induſtry deſerves it. 'Tis true, Eſtates are otherwiſe ſettled, *and I ſhould believe my ſelf obliged to obſerve my Countries Cuſtoms, if others would do the ſame: But I perceive the Gentry can ſet the* Conſtitution *aſide, without any Scruple. They can Tilt through one anothers Lungs in a Bravado, though the Law makes Hanging matter on't. Why ſhould we be more Slaves to the Goverment than others, I'm ſure we do not get ſo much by it? We are enough of us, let us mind our Buſineſs.* 'Tis true, this would be a lewd Project; but 'tis the Conſequence of your own Principle, therefore have a care of ſetting the Example.

Philot. If we take a greater Freedom with the Government than the Vulgar, our Quality is our Excuſe; that will bear us out.

Philal. Quite contrary. For firſt, a Gentleman is ſuppoſed to be better acquainted with the Laws than a Peaſant; therefore his Breaking them muſt be a greater Fault, becauſe it implies more of Contempt in the Action.

Secondly, Where the Example is of worſe Conſequence, the care to check it ſhould be the greater. The Influence of Men of Figure is Conſiderable. When They are at the Head of an ill Cuſtom, they have preſently a Train to attend them. The Infection

ſpreads

ſpreads like Lightning; and 'tis a Credit to live counter to Reaſon and Regularity. The ſlender Principles, the looſe Practices of theſe Men, is that which has ſo effectually Debauched the Age. This is it which has expoſed Virtue, and baniſhed Religion, and almoſt buried the Diſtinctions of Good and Evil.

Thirdly, Since Quality is a Diſtinction ſettled by Law; thoſe who have the greateſt Share of this Privilege are moſt obliged to obſerve the publick Regulations. The Government is a great Benefactor to ſuch Perſons, and they are very ungenerous and ungrateful, if they fly in the Face of it. A Man that enjoys Honour and Eſtate by a Society, has greater Engagements to Regard it, than he who receives only a common Protection. One has perhaps a 1000 *l. per Annum* for keeping the Laws, and the other nothing but his Labour for his Pains: And pray which is moſt to blame then if they break them?

Philot. You ſeem to forget that their Fortune and Condition follows their Birth, ſo that they are only obliged to their Family for the Advantage.

Philal. You argue too faſt. Pray are not *Deſcents* and Inheritances governed by Law? What Claim can we make to Privilege or Property without it? A Man when

he is about it, may as eaſily be born to 10000 *l.* a year as to 10 Pence. The Trouble to himſelf, or his Mother, is much the ſame as to that matter. People come into the World in *Turky* the ſame way they do Here; and yet, excepting the Royal Family, they get but little by it. Nature has ſet us all upon a Level as to theſe Things: 'Tis only the *Conſtitution* which makes the Difference; and therefore thoſe who have the Advantage, ſhould pay it a proportionable Reſpect.——

Philot. I perceive you are coming on again: And to ſtop you a little, let me tell you, 'tis my Obſervation, That the Cuſtom of Duels puts Gentlemen upon their good Behaviour, 'tis a check upon Converſation, and makes it more inoffenſive than it would be otherwiſe.

Philal. An admirable Remedy! Juſt ſuch a one as Death is againſt all Diſeaſes. If there muſt be Diſputes, is not Squabling leſs inconvenient than Murther? Had not a Man better have a black Eye, than a Napkin drawn through him; and Bleed rather at the Noſe than at the Heart? Theſe Conteſts, though much better let alone, make neither Orphans, nor Widows, nor perpetuate Feuds among Families. Beſides, the Diſorders of Converſation may be prevented without ſuch a dangerous Expedient.

For

For not to mention Religion, a moderate ſhare of Prudence and Behaviour will do the Buſineſs. 'Tis not yet the Faſhion for Women of Quality to Tilt. Now though they can hate one another pretty heartily; though their Humours are full as nice, and their Paſſions as ſtrong, as thoſe of the other Sex; yet the Senſe of Decency is ſufficient to keep them from coarſe Language, and rude Provocations.

Philot. However, Miſunderſtandings will happen ſometimes. And when they do, it does not become Gentlemen to manage them like leſſer People. Their Revenges muſt be particular, as well as the reſt of their Breeding. It looks as odly for them to Quarrel, as to Salute like a Clown.

Philal. So that I perceive if Butchers had but the Manners to go to *Sharps*, Gentlemen would be contented with a Rubber at Cuffs. If they muſt be ſingular in their Diſputes, let it be for the better I beſeech you. Let us not be ſo vain as to think it a Commendation to be more unreaſonable in our Demands, and more ſavage in our Reſentments than the Meaneſt, and moſt Undiſciplined. If they muſt run counter to the Vulgar in every thing, I wonder they don't leave off Swearing, Drinking, *&c.* Theſe, by their Aſſiſtance, are grown *Plebeian* Vices;

Inſomuch that Porters and Foot-men are as perfect in them as themſelves.

Philot. I grant you Clowns may Box it off, and be quiet; this way of Satisfaction is agreable enough to their little Pretenſions. But the Honour of a Gentleman muſt have other ſort of Damages.

Philal. If the Diſpute was between Peaſant and Gentleman, you would ſay ſomething, though not enough. But you know a Gentleman is not obliged to Fight another who is not ſo. Now where the Condition of the Diſobliged is equal, at leaſt to the Degree of Gentlemen; why ſhould the Affront be counted ſo mortal an Injury? I know no reaſon for this, unleſs you will ſay, That Men of Quality are obliged to be more Bloudy and Implacable; and to carry their Paſſions to greater heights of Fury, than other People. But this Plea proves them really leſs, not greater than the common Size of Mankind; and is far wide of the true Character of Honour. If Quality conſiſts in ſuch Sallies as theſe are; Tigers and Fiends may put in for a conſiderable Share.

Philot. If this way of deciding Quarrels among Gentlemen were peculiar to our Age or Country, your Reaſoning would have more Force; but we have almoſt a general Preſcription of Time and Place againſt you.

Philal.

Philal. Not ſo General as may be brought for the Heathen Religion, or the *Alcoran*; and yet I hope you will not plead in defence of either of theſe. To give you an Inſtance near home. The *French* you know are far from being an inconſiderable Nation. Their Nobility are as numerous, and their Pretenſions as well ſupported; they have as much Fire in their Tempers, and as much Regard for their Honour, as any of their Neighbours: Notwithſtanding this, you ſee the Practice of Duelling is abſolutely ſuppreſſed, and they are all contented to refer their Grievances to the Government.

Philot. The *French* King takes more care to right a Gentleman's Honour than is done with us, which makes the Caſe different.

Philal. Particular ſatisfaction for every Affront in Converſation cannot be awarded by *Stated Laws*; the Circumſtances are too many to be brought within a Rule. A Prince muſt be little leſs than abſolute to do this effectually. Now ſuch a ſtretch of Prerogative would be agreeable neither to the *Engliſh* Genius, nor *Conſtitution*. And is it not a hard Caſe that we muſt either deliver up all our Property to the Crown, or our Lives to every ungovernable Paſſion and Caprice?

Farther. You may remember that the Subject holds his Honour and Eſtate by no other

other Tenure then the Laws. What a monſtrous Injuſtice; what an Ingratitude; what an inſufferable Pride muſt it then be, for private Men to erect a Magiſtracy of their own; to *Judge* and *Execute* in Matters of Life and Death; and to *Hang* and *Draw* within themſelves? If the Subjects may ſet the Laws aſide with ſo little Ceremony, and make Supplemental Proviſions at Diſcretion, the ſignificancy of Government will be unintelligible. If Authority may be ſlighted in an Inſtance of ſo high a Nature, why not in a hundred? And when the *Fences* are thus broken down, Peace and Property Good-night!

Philot. Your mentioning the *French*, puts me in mind of the old *Romans*; they were a very brave People: Pray what was their Practiſe in the Caſe, for I have almoſt forgot it?

Philal. Not at all for your purpoſe. 'Tis true, There was a ſort of Duelling among them, as that of the *Horatii*, and *Curiatii*; of *Manlius Torquatus*, and the *Gaul* that Challenged the Army. But then there was a difference in the Perſons and Occaſion. Theſe Duelliſts were Enemies, Subjects of different Princes, a ſort of Fighting *Repreſentatives*, choſen like *David* and *Goliah*, to decide the Controverſy of the Field. At leaſt the Conteſt was allowed by Publick Authority,

thority, and undertaken upon the ſcore of their Country. But as for one Subjects cutting anothers Throat about private Diſputes, they were perfect Strangers to theſe Methods of Juſtice. When *Milo* killed *Clodius* upon the Road, though there was no ſuch thing as a Challenge; though *Tully* proves it no more then a *Rencounter*; yet becauſe there was a former miſunderſtanding between them; neither the Rhetorick of the *Council*, nor the bravery of the *Priſoner*, could prevent the *Execution*.

Philot. After all; you cannot deny but that the preſent Cuſtom has prevailed for ſeveral Ages.

Philal. So have a great many other ill things beſides. There is ſcarcely any Extravagance ſo ſingular as to want a Precedent. But Cuſtom without Reaſon, is no better then antient Error. And ſince you preſs your Preſcription, I ſhall trace it to the Original. Now the Practiſe of Subjects Righting themſelves by the Sword, was introduced by the *Lombards*, *Saxons*, and *Normans*. A People, who poſſibly at that time of day, had not Brains to decide the matter any other way. For how much ſoever they may be of kin to us, we muſt own they were a very unpoliſhed ſort of Mortals. And why ſhould we be tied up to the Dictates of Paganiſm and Ignorance? If a Man's Houſe, and Habit,

Habit, and Eating, was not better than theirs; he would not be thought to have much of the Spirit of a Gentleman. If we are bound to implicit Submiſſion; if we are to follow Antiquity, without any Exceptions of Judgment; Why don't we feed upon *Maſt*, and lodge in Caves, and go almoſt Naked? And to come nearer our Northern Anceſtors; Why don't we vindicate our ſelves by Tryal *Ordeal*? Bath our Innocence in *Scalding Water*, and hop over *heated Plough-ſhares* Blindfold?

Farther, We may obſerve that the Barbarity of this Cuſtom was ſomewhat reſtrained, and bound up, to certain Forms of Law. The Occaſion was generally Conſiderable: Either for wiping off Imputations of Treaſon, or proſecuting Appeals of Murther, or trying Titles of Land. As for the Diſputes of *Sharpers*, of Bottles, Dice, and Wenches, we don't read of any Proviſions made for the Honour of ſuch Sparks, and Diverſions as theſe. We may obſerve,

Secondly, That the Men were juſt come off from Heatheniſm, and very undiſciplined in Life. Their Reaſon was in the *Oar*, and their Underſtandings as low as their Morals. This Condition of things made their Princes either miſlead or indulge them. They had Authority to miſguide their Conſcience, to encourage their Revenge, and in ſome

ſome meaſure to excuſe it. The *Writ of Combat* was made out in the King's Courts, and the whole manage of the Quarrel under the Direction of the Government. 'Twas none of their way to be kill'd in Hugger-mugger, and ſteal a Stabbing as they do now. (*Cotton. poſthum.*)

Thirdly, If they fought without publick Allowance, and any Perſon fell in the Quarrel, the Survivers were apprehended and tryed for *Murther.*

Fourthly, Theſe *Combats*, though governed by theſe Reſtrictions, and under the Countenance of Law, were always condemned by the *Cenſures* of the Church.

Philot. Do you think then, they are not capable of Regulation?

Philal. No more than Adultery. This Practiſe is *Malum in ſe*; and an ill thing cannot be done within a Rule. 'Tis like a ſtrong Poyſon, it muſt be Expelled; for all the Cooking in Nature will ne're make Diet on't. 'Tis true, there are degrees in Deformity, as well as Beauty; and therefore ſome Caſes may be more remarkable then others. For the purpoſe; when a Gentleman of Eſtate Fights an indigent Bully, who poſſibly knows no more how to live in this World, then he does in the next. This Man is angry to ſee his Neighbour in eaſy Circumſtances. And when it comes once to this;

the

the ſtrength of his Malice and the Opinion of his Skill, will pick a Quarrel from a ſlender Occaſion. Now ſhould I deſire him to get an anſwerable Fortune before the *Glove* comes: To make the hazards of the Combat equal, their Pockets as well their as Weapons ſhould be in ſome meaſure adjuſted. To throw down a few Farthings, and make a Noiſe to have them covered with Gold; would be abſurd in a *Wager*; And a Man muſt be very weak to accept it. And if Life be either valuable to keep, or dangerous to looſe, one would think the Paralel ſhould hold. This venturing All againſt Nothing, puts me in mind of *Mark Antony*, who after he had loſt the Battle at *Actium*, and was Penned up in *Alexandria*, would needs ſend *Auguſtus* a Challenge. *Cæſars* Anſwer was, *That if he was weary of Living, there was other ways of Diſpatch beſides Fighting him; And for his part he ſhould not trouble himſelf to be his Executioner.* *Antony*, I ſuppoſe, thought the return reaſonable; and in a ſhort time did his own Buſineſs.

Philot. I confeſs, as you have repreſented the Caſe, it looks odly enough.

Philal. I will give you one that's more odd, if you call it ſo. I mean the Myſtery of *Seconds*, and *Thirds*.

This is ſuch a Maſterpiece; that I think no Deſcription can reach it. Theſe Under-

pullers

pullers in Diſtraction, are ſuch implicit Mortals as are not to be matched upon any other occaſion: A perfect Stranger ſhall Engage them at the firſt word. To ask Queſtions would be ungentile. On they go without any Acquaintance either with the Man, or the Matter. A moſt honourable Undertaking, to Fight about they know not what; for, and againſt, they know not whom! So that for ought they can tell, they may be under the Pious neceſſity of Murthering their Father.

Philot. However you can't ſay there is any *Malice Prepence.*

Philal. Right! There is nothing *Prepence*; neither Malice nor Reaſon. But for all that, I don't like a Man that can hate at firſt Sight, and kill *Extempore*?

Philot You miſtake, a *Second* is not angry. He only engages in Complaiſance to his *Principal.*

Philal. So much the worſe; becauſe it argues the greater Contempt of human Kind. For my Heart, I can't underſtand a Combatant that can kill in cool Blood; and ſhew the utmoſt effects of Rage without Paſſion! 'Tis a Sign his common Temper is as bad as the Malice, and Provocations of other People. This Stoical Improvement, is the Philoſophy of a Butcher. It makes a *Beaſt* of an Enemy, and knocks him down with

with as little concern as if he were an Oxe.

Philot. To requite you for your extraordinary Inſtances, I will give you a pretty tough one on the other ſide. If a Souldier refuſes a Challenge from another, he will not only be counted a Coward, but in all likelihood Caſhiered into the Bargain.

Philal. The Caſe is hard I confeſs, but not yours; for you are none of the *Military Liſt.* To thoſe who may be concerned, I anſwer.

1. You know the Challenger is puniſhed as well as the Challenged; which Diſcipline will prevent the Caſe from being common. But when it does happen, it may be replied in the

Second Place, That he who profeſſes Arms, may prove his Courage by more defenſible Inſtances. His former Behaviour in the Field is oftentimes ſufficient to wipe off an Aſperſion of Cowardize.

Thirdly, If he is not furniſhed with Proof this way: Let him deſire his Superior Officer that the next time he is drawn out, the Challenger may be Poſted near him. And then would I heartily convince him, and the Enemy to boot, that I wanted no Reſolution. If a Man miſcarries in ſuch a Tryal, he may juſtify himſelf to his Reaſon. He dyes in his *Calling*; and if nothing elſe

elſe hinders, he may look the other World in the Face.

Philot. But a Souldier may ſometimes wait a long while for ſuch an Opportunity of purging himſelf: And would you have him ſtarved, and laughed at, in the mean time?

Philal. Let him remember he is a Chriſtian as well as a Souldier; and that he was firſt *Liſted* under God Almighty. Now a Man of Honour will rather ſtarve, than be falſe to a ſolemn Engagement. And where the Cauſe is juſt, he is to be commended for his Conſtancy. And if Intereſt ſtrikes in too, 'tis not only Criminal but Weakneſs to deſert it. As for the point of Contempt, let him return it with pity: 'Tis no Diſhonour to be undervalued by thoſe who want either Underſtanding, or Conſcience, or both. If bare Contempt without Reaſon is ſo terribly Significant, a Fool would be better than a Philoſopher; a Slave than an Emperour; provided the firſt had but the Inſolence to ſcorn the latter.

Philot. For all that, you will have a great many againſt you.

Philal. So there are a great many Sheep, but I think ne're the Wiſer for their Number.

Philot. Do you think then this Cuſtom is ſo abſolutely forbidden by Religion?

Philal. I am ſurprized one Baptized ſhould

put the Queſtion! In earneſt, I believe this Notion of Honour as much an Idol, as *Nebuchadnezzar's Golden Image:* 'Tis ſet up by the ſame Intereſt, and probably has done more Miſchief.

Philot. If it be ſo, the *Mettal* muſt be good, according to your own Compariſon.

Philal. Yes. But the Worſhip is ſtark naught, and leſs to be choſen than the *Fiery Furnace.* 'Tis great pity ſo much good *Blood* ſhould be offered at it. That Men who have ſuch Opportunities for Senſe, ſhould be entangled in ſo monſtrous an Abſurdity! That thoſe who might be the Ornament of their Age, and Defence of their Country, ſhould make themſelves a Misfortune to both!

Philot. I believe the danger of the Adventure makes them think it honourable.

Philal. Look you! To riſque the *Main* without Reaſon or Warrant, is Raſhneſs: 'Tis to be more Stupid than Brave. If a Man ſhould leap a *Garret*, or vault down the *Monument*, do you imagine he would leave the *Memory* of a Hero behind him?

Philot. Methinks 'tis fine to ſeem above the Impreſſions of Fear, and to Flaſh in the Face of Danger.

Philal. I grant you Fortitude is a very valuable Quality. But then it muſt be under

der the Conduct of Prudence and Juſtice: Without this Aſſiſtance the beſt Event will prove Ruinous, and the Victory it ſelf a *Defeat*.

Philot. You mean Religion will not endure the Duelling Principle.

Philal. No more than all the *Hereſies* ſince *Simon Magus*. 'Tis a Principle ſo full of Pride, and Paſſion, and Revenge; ſo Tempeſtuous and Abſurd; ſo abſolutely unallied to Reaſon and Good-nature, that poliſht Heatheniſm would be aſhamed on't. In a Word, 'Tis as contrary to the Tendency and Temper of Chriſtianity, as *Hobs's Creed* is to the *Apoſtles*, as Light is to Darkneſs, as God is to the Devil.

Philot. 'Tis a hard matter to part with the Character of a Gentleman.

Philal. Fear it not. As long as the Laws are on our ſide, the *Heraldry* is all ſafe And if it were otherwiſe, let us remember we are Chriſtians. If there happens a Competition between theſe two Pretenſions; let us drop the Gentleman and keep the Chriſtian; for he is a Perſon of the beſt Quality.

Philot. Say you ſo?

Philal. Yes. I ſay a Chriſtian and no Gentleman, is more a Perſon of *Condition*, than a Gentleman and no Chriſtian. The former is more nobly *Related*, Born to a

greater *Fortune*, and better Founded in perſonal Merit.

Philot. You ſay ſomething. I wiſh you would enlarge upon this Head.

Philal. You know my Buſineſs is not Preaching; any Divine will give you Satisfaction.

Philot. Upon ſecond Thoughts, they need not: A little of the *Bible* will do it without them. To ſpeak frankly, I am ſo well ſatisfied upon the whole, that I am reſolved to take no Notice of my Spark; but I am afraid he will *Poſt* me up for a Coward, and how then?

Philal. I would mind it no more than the Railing of a Feaver, or a *Proclamation* from *Bedlam.*

Philot. I ſhall take your Adviſe. But I muſt tell you withall, That if he *draws* upon me in the Streets, I will not be ſo paſſive as to let the Sun ſhine through me if I can help it.

Philal. I have nothing to ſay as to that. But then you ſhould wiſh the Occaſion may never happen; and keep your Reſolution to your ſelf. For to give out this ſort of Language, looks too like a Provocation: And if you ſhould be ſo unfortunately ſet upon, be ſure you keep within the Compaſs of Self-defence.

OF

General Kindneſs.

The Fifth CONFERENCE BETWEEN *Philotimus* and *Philalethes*.

Philot. WHat falſe, humorſome, inſipid Creatures are Men! Sure theſe are none of the beſt Things God ever made! Upon the whole, I think one might as good disband, and turn Hermit, as be troubled with them any longer. I begin now to underſtand the Conduct of the firſt *Monks*, but believe their *Hiſtory* miſreported. They fled the Perſecution of Mankind, more than that of a ſingle Tyrant. They prefer'd the Wilderneſs to the Town, and found their Safety and their Satisfaction better ſecured in Solitude, than *Society*. For a wild Beaſt does not pretend above his *Order*, and is ſo frank

as to diſcover his Deſign: But a Man is a Beaſt, and yet has not the Modeſty to own it. Hah! here is *Philalethes*, he has overheard me: In earneſt, I ſhall be called to an Account for my Expoſtulations!

Philal. What, Mr. *Hobs*'s Ghoſt! No leſs than a Satyr upon your whole Kind? I'm not ſorry I have interrupted your Soliloquies, except they had been better natured.

Philot. I did not think you had been ſo near: But ſince you have catched me, give me leave to tell you I know the World, and upon Experiment I find there is not one in forty without Deſign, or Vanity, in their Converſation. Pray peruſe your Acquaintance well, and if you don't diſcover ſome *Flaw* in their Honeſty, or their Humour, I'm much miſtaken.

Philal. Are not you a Man, *Philotimus*?

Philot. What then?

Philal. Then, by your own Confeſſion, 'tis forty to one but that ſome part of the diſagreable Character belongs to your ſelf.

Philot. However, you know Odds will not win Wagers; Difficulties are not Demonſtrations; 'tis unreaſonable to argue from Improbabilities againſt Matter of *Fact*. If I find my ſelf Well; if my Conſtitution, or my Care, is my *Preſervative*, you muſt not charge the *Plague* upon me, becauſe I converſe with *Epidemical* Infection.

Philal.

Philal. You are reſolved to keep *Well* with your ſelf: I doubt not but in time your good Opinion will reach your Neighbours: They may, to uſe your own Similitude, be as free from *Contagion* as your ſelf: And if they are ſeized, the Plague is not always *Mortal.* Beſides, it might have been your own Caſe. So that all things conſidered, I hope you will not *Mark* the *Houſe* upon bare Suſpition: And when the *Tokens* appear, you will pity their Condition, and endeavour their *Recovery.*

Philot. Do deal freely, I ſhall take care of my ſelf, and ſo I ſuppoſe will every body elſe that is wiſe. For that which People call *Univerſal Benevolence* is but a piece of *Knight Errantry*: It looks prettily in a *Romance*, but in *Life* 'tis neither prudent, nor practicable.

Philal. Do you think it ſo impracticable an Abſurdity to wiſh all People well, and endeavour to make them ſo?

Philot. What of all Perſwaſions, Countries, Tempers, and Conditions, whatſoever?

Philal. Yes. We comprehend all Mankind in the *League.*

Philot. You have a notable Graſp: I dare not ſtrain my Inclinations at that rate. I love to keep fair with the World as well as you, but it may be upon different Reaſons. In a word, I take Civility to be only a Com-

pliance with the Mode, Friendſhip but another Name for Trade, all mercenary and deſigning. Indeed conſidering the ſtate of humane Affairs, 'tis next to impoſſible to be otherwiſe. Where there is ſo much of Indigence, Competition, and Uncertainty, you muſt expect Self-intereſt will govern. You may obſerve, That which you call *Good Nature*, is moſt remarkable in the Young and Unexperienced. Such Perſons I confeſs are often very Laviſh of their Favours, and Careſſing in their Converſation: But theſe Blandiſhments ſeem only deſigned for a State of Impotence; that what they can't carry by Force and Foreſight, they may obtain by Flattery. Like unfledged Birds, they are fond of every one, that they may be *Fed* the better. And where this Reaſon fails, that which I am going to add will ſupply it.

Philal. What is that?

Philot. Why young People generally don't Think ſo far as others, nor conſider a Neceſſity at a Diſtance: This often makes them more Liberal than Wiſe. They are apt to be over-credulous at firſt Setting out; and cannot ſo well ſee through Artifice and Pretence: So that 'tis no wonder if they beſtow their Inclinations too freely upon their Neighbours.

Philal. This early Diſpoſition to *Oblige*, appears to me an Impreſſion of Nature, which

which was intended for Continuance: For as the Uſe and Poſture of the *Limbs* hold the ſame in Manhood as they were in Infancy; ſo one would think the *Motions* of the Mind ſhould be ſet Right at firſt. And therefore when good Humour happens to wear off with *Age*, it ſeems to proceed from Miſmanagement; and looks more like a Degeneracy of Nature, than an Improvement of Reaſon. If you pleaſe to hear me, I ſhall endeavour to prove *Univerſal Benevolence* both an acknowledged, and a practicable Diſpoſition.

Philot. Pray begin.

Philal. My firſt Argument then ſhall be drawn from Community of Nature. We are all caſt in the ſame *Mould*, allied in our Paſſions, and in our Faculties: We have the ſame Deſires to ſatisfy, and generally the ſame Pleaſure in ſatisfying of them. All Mankind is as it were one great *Being*, divided into ſeveral Parts; every part having the ſame Properties and Affections with another. Now as we can't chuſe but deſire Accommodations for our own Support and Pleaſure; ſo if we leave Nature to her Original Biaſs, if we hearken to the undepraved Suggeſtions of our Minds, we ſhall wiſh the ſame Conveniencies to others. For the apprehending a Being ſo like our own, in proſperous Circumſtances, muſt be an Advance-

vancement of our ſelves: By this we ſee as it were our own Nature pleaſed, and Flouriſhing in another. And thus much Mr. *Hobs* himſelf confeſſes to the Ruin of his *Cauſe*, *That the Senſe of having communicated Satisfaction is naturally Delightful.*

Philot. But will this Notion ſpread wide enough to do any Execution?

Philal. Yes. For if a Man can but diſengage himſelf from the Exceſſes of Self-love, in a ſingle Inſtance, he does the Buſineſs. If he can but wiſh well to another, without making Intereſt the only Motive, he may be generous enough to take all Mankind into his Affections. For he that can do it to one, without any mercenary View, may for the ſame reaſon do it to a Million. 'Tis but repeating the Action, where for his Encouragement the Pleaſure will be likewiſe repeated. ——.

Philot. You are going too faſt. The different Capacities and Behaviour of Men will leave your Repetition neither Senſe, nor Poſſibility: For to love Inſignificancy is Dotage, and ſeldom paſſes any farther than Children or *Relations.* ——

Philal. For all that; one may wiſh a poor Man an Eſtate, or a Fool Underſtanding; there is no unconquerable Averſion, nor ſo much as any Difficulty in theſe things.

Philot.

Philot. I ſay farther; to love malitious and diſobliging Qualities is impoſſible.

Philal. If thoſe Qualities were inſeparable from the *Object*, I grant your Meaning: But where Malice is only *Accidental*, and Reformation poſſible, the Caſe is otherwiſe. A Phyſician may have a Kindneſs for the *Patient*, without being fond of the *Diſeaſe*.

Philot. To illuſtrate your Diſtinction. If a Man gives me a ſower Box on the Ear; I may love the *Hand*, though I don't like the *Blow*. I aſſure you he that can thus abſtract the Affront from the Perſon that gives it, and take off a Cuff ſo metaphyſically, is very much a Philoſopher.

Philal. If you are not ſatisfied, I'll conſider your Objection farther afterwards. At preſent I ſhall go on to a ſecond Proof, That Univerſal Benevolence is agreable to humane Nature, unleſs you have a mind to interpoſe.

Philot. Not juſt now. Take your Method.

Philal. I prove my Point, from that *Compaſſion* which generally follows any conſiderable Misfortune. This Civility is ſo very common, and ſo much expected, that thoſe who are unconcerned at the Troubles of another, are called *Inhumane. i. e.* They are degenerated from their Kind, and don't deſerve the Name of Men. And does it not plainly follow, That thoſe who are thus

ſenſibly

ſenſibly Touched, muſt have a real Kindneſs for the Unfortunate?

Philot. I think not. For Compaſſion is but the Conſequence of Infirmity, and bottom'd upon Self-love. We are affected with what another ſuffers, becauſe this puts us in mind we are not ſecure our ſelves. And when our Neighbour's Calamity diſcovers more than the poſſibility of our own, 'tis no wonder if we are ſomewhat uneaſy.

Philal. I grant you Compaſſion may be ſometimes accounted for, as you ſay: But then 'tis a Miſtake to ſuppoſe it can come from no other Cauſe. For 'tis eaſy to obſerve, That the moſt generous Diſpoſitions are the moſt Compaſſionate. Such Perſons, though their Fortune is never ſo well Guarded; though the greatneſs of their Mind exempts them from Fear, and makes them leaſt concerned for any Accident of their own, yet none condole and ſympathize more heartily than they. 'Tis plain therefore that this Pity and Tenderneſs, being ſo void of Self-intereſt, muſt proceed from Good-will.

Philot. Go on. I ſhall come in with you by and by.

Philal. I affirm then in the

Third place, That 'tis not agreable to the Attributes of God to ſuppoſe, that he has made the Nature of Man ſuch, that according

ding to his Original Inclinations, he ſhould be unconcerned about the Happineſs of his Neighbour.

Philot. Why ſo?

Philal. Becauſe this would be a Reflection both upon the Goodneſs, and Wiſdom, of God Almighty.

Philot. Prove the Parts of your Aſſertion.

Philal. 1. This Suppoſition is repugnant to the Goodneſs of God. For can we imagiue that God, who is infinite Goodneſs himſelf, who made all rational Creatures that they might be Happy; can we imagine that he ſhould contradict the Affections of his own Bleſſed Nature, and form a *Being* wholly unlike himſelf? A *Being* which he would not only hate as ſoon as it was made; but, which is more, he could impute his Diſlike to nothing but his own Workmanſhip? But if either out of Indifferency, or Diſaffection, 'twas contrary to the Nature of Man to wiſh the Happineſs of another, he muſt be ſuch a Thing as I have deſcribed. And is it poſſible to conceive, That Goodneſs and Perfection can be the Parent of ſo unlovely an Offſpring? That the over-flowing Generouſneſs of the Divine Nature, would create immortal Beings with mean or envious Principles? To be thus furniſh'd, would make them both Miſerable and Troubleſom; neither

ther acceptable to this World, nor fit for the other.

Philot. Theſe Inclinations you ſo much diſlike are very common; therefore if they don't come from *Above*, you muſt find them out ſome other Original.

Philal. That will be done without difficulty. To begin; The Reaſon which hinders Men from wiſhing the Happineſs of others, proceeds ſometimes from the Prejudices of Education, from the ill Examples and Flatteries of thoſe they firſt converſed with, and ſometimes 'tis afterwards contracted by their own Fault. The general Cauſe of this Depravation, is Covetouſneſs, and Pride.

1. An immoderate Love of Money ſpoils thoſe generous Diſpoſitions they were ſent into the World with. It confines their Affections to their *Pockets*, and ſhrinks up their Deſires into the narrow and ſcandalous Compaſs of their own Concerns. Their Nature is ſo impoveriſh'd by their ill Management, that they are not able to ſpare one kind Wiſh from themſelves, nor expend one generous Thought in favour of another.

Philot. The Caſe is ſomewhat worſe than you have repreſented it. People don't always keep within the terms of Neutrality. They are not contented to forbear Wiſhing well, but

but are oftentimes averſe to the Happineſs of others.

Philal. Right. When Pride ſtrikes in, that is the Conſequence. This Vice makes Men think their Neighbours Advantage prejudicial to their own; and that the greateſt Pleaſure is to ſee others beneath them. Such an ill-natured Notion as this, made Lucifer uneaſy, and envious in Heaven; and we know what was the Iſſue. Far be it from us to ſuppoſe, that God would ſtamp ſuch Ignoble, ſuch Apoſtatizing Qualities upon any rational Being. Theſe would not be the *Image* of the Deity, but the Devil.

Philot. In my Opinion *Self-love* ſeems the beſt Expedient to ſecure *Individuals*. By ſuch a Bent of Nature, a Man will be ſure to take care of one, and not leave his Buſineſs to the Generoſity of his Neighbours.

Philal. If every one could ſtand upon his own Legs, what you ſay would have a better Colour. However, your Objection leads me to ſhew you, That it reflects upon the *Wiſdom* of God, to ſuppoſe Men made with ſuch narrow inconverſable Inclinations: For by this Temper they would be unfit for *Society*. But God has deſign'd Man a *ſociable* Creature. To this end he has ſent him into the World weak, and defenceleſs; ſo that without the Care of others 'tis impoſſible for him to ſubſiſt. And when he is beſt able to Shift, if he had

had no Aſſiſtance, or Converſe but his own, the Indigence of his Nature would make him very uneaſy, and ill ſupplied.

Now there is nothing ſo ſtrongly cements Society; nothing makes it flower, and flouriſh ſo much, as a hearty Regard to the publick Good. 'Tis *general Kindneſs* and Good-will, which eſtabliſhes the Peace, and promotes the Proſperity of a People: To ſay, this *Diſpoſition* keeps Men juſt and inoffenſive, is too mean a Commendation. It improves their Practice much higher, and makes them Munificent and Obliging. Without this Virtue the publick Union muſt unlooſe, the Strength decay, and the Pleaſure grow faint and languid. And can we ſuppoſe that God would underfurniſh Man for the State he deſigned him, and not afford him a Soul large enough to purſue his Happineſs? That he ſhould give him *Solitary* Principles, and yet intend him for publick Converſe? Create him ſo, that he ſhall naturally care for nothing but himſelf; and at the ſame time make his Intereſt depend upon mutual Affection, and good Correſpondence with others? Is it imaginable that ſuch a comprehenſive Wiſdom, which has made all things in *Number*, *Weight*, and *Meaſure*; ſecured the Preſervation of *Brutes*, by Inſtinct and Sympathy, and made ſo fair a Proviſion for the inferiour World; Is it to be conceived, I ſay, that ſo glorious a *Providence*

dence ſhould not proportion the Faculties of his nobleſt Creatures, but ſend them into *Being* with Inclinations unſuitable to the Condition they muſt neceſſarily be placed in?

Philot. Under favour, there are other *Materials* for a Commonwealth beſides *ſtark Love* and *Kindneſs*, and I believe the Building might laſt, without tempering the Morter with *Hony*. What do you ſay to the fear of receiving *Harm*, and the hopes of Aſſiſtance? Theſe are the Motives of Self-love, and I think ſufficient to make Men juſt, and willing to do a good Turn.

Philal. Truly I think not. I grant you theſe Motives are not inſignificant: They have an Intereſt in Life, but not enough to puſh it to Perfection, and ſecure it's Happineſs. For firſt they will not reſtrain a ſecret Miſchief, which conſidering the unfortified State of Mankind, is a great Defect. Beſides, the Agreableneſs of Society muſt be loſt this way. 'Tis Inclination and Endearment that gives Life and Pleaſure. But when People have nothing but Fears, and Jealouſies and Plots in their Heads, there is no *Muſick* in their Company. And farther, I would gladly know, how theſe ſcanty Principles can explain why Men ſhould dye for their Friends, and ſacrifice their Intereſt for their Country, without Neceſſity? By the Maxims of Self-love, ſuch Actions as theſe muſt be fooliſh and unnatural: And yet thoſe who are

thus forgetful of themſelves, have been alwas reckon'd the Nobleſt, and beſt Deſerving.

Philot. You forget that there is ſuch a thing as Honour and vain Glory in the World. This is the Bait that catches the Men you ſpeak of: 'Tis the Reputation of the Action that fires their Spirits, and makes them ſo Prodigal, and Reſigning.

Philal. In earneſt you are catched your ſelf! Your Objection ſuppoſes the Truth of what I am contending for. It ſuppoſes that Benevolence and Generoſity are poſſeſſed of the publick Eſteem; That they have Cuſtom and *Preſcription* on their ſide; That they are the higheſt Improvements of the Will, the moſt admired and heroick Qualities. Now 'tis very ſtrange, ſo univerſal a Conſent ſhould be founded in a Miſtake; and none but Mr. *Hobs*, and ſome few of his Diſcipling, ſhould underſtand the Operations of their own Minds, and the right Conſtitution of them.

Philot. Well! If this World won't ſatisfy you, the other ſhall. I ſay then, That the fear of *inviſible Powers*, and the Expectations of future Puniſhments, are ſufficient to keep Men upon their *good Behaviour*; to be a check upon their Privacies, and make them honeſt at Midnight. And yet after all, they may have no great Stomach to the Matter. 'Tis the *Rod*, not the Inclination, which learns the *Leſſon*.

Philal. I grant you the Diſciplining part of Religion

Religion is very ſignificant. However, it would not give a ſufficient Relief in this Caſe.

Philot. Why ſo?

Philal. Becauſe upon your Suppoſition the Force of it would be loſt. For if the Nature of Man was averſe to *general Kindneſs*; if he could not chuſe but think it unreaſonable to love any Body but himſelf, then God in commanding him to love his Neighbour would oblige him to an impoſſibility. We might as well be commanded to taſte Gall as ſweet as Hony: For 'tis as much in our Power to alter the *Perceptions* of our Senſes, as to love any thing contrary to our Reaſon and Inclination. Upon this Suppoſition therefore no Man could have an inward Affection for his Neighbour, which yet 'tis certain we are obliged to have.

Philot. If I am uſed well I'll ne'er trouble my ſelf about what People think. If they always act like Friends, they may *wiſh* like Enemies, if they pleaſe.

Philal. Have a Care! If they are not ſo *within*, they will not be long ſo *without*. For if we had a kind of Antipathy againſt minding any thing but our ſelves: If we thought our own Intereſt prejudiced, or our Quiet embarraſſed by being concerned for others, in this Caſe, all Offices of Humanity and Obligation, would be ſo many Acts of Penance. And ſince the opportunities of Obliging return ſo faſt; to be commanded the Uſe of them, would

make our Lives almoſt a perpetual Torment. It would be like feeding upon that we naturally abhor; which inſtead of nouriſhing, would throw us into *Sweats* and *Convulſions*. And at this rate a Kindneſs would often be a greater Miſchief to the Doer, than a Benefit to the Receiver. The Upſhot is, that if the Mind of Man was naturally averſe from Wiſhing well to any thing but himſelf, the command of *general Benevolence* would be impoſſible to be entertain'd in Principle, and Affection. And as for the Counterfeit in outward Practiſe, that would be ſuch a Grievance to ill Nature, that very few would ſubmit to it. For if Men are ſo unreaſonable as not to be governed by Religion Now, when 'tis both profitable and pleaſant, of how little force would it be, ſhould it lye almoſt wholly in Violence and Averſion? If Envy, and ill Nature, were the natural Frame and Complexion of the Mind, Religion would ſignify not much towards Reformation; ſo that *Society* could receive but ſmall Advantage from thence.——

Philot. Hold! Don't cry Victory, I have a Reſerve for you. Beſides, you owe me ſome Satisfaction to an old Objection.

Philal. What's that?

Philot. I told you that the Injuriouſneſs and the Vanity of a great part of the World was ſuch, That general Kindneſs, if it came down from Speculation to Practiſe, would be quickly out

out of doors. I confeſs if we could ſtand clear of the *Troubleſome* and the *Treacherous*, I could be as good natured as the beſt of you. But alaſs, we are in *fæce Romuli*, and that's enough to ſtir any Man's Spleen, that has either his Underſtanding, or his Senſes about him.

Philal. You find Coldneſs and Diſaffection very general, and thence you argue from *Fact* to Neceſſity. 'Tis ſo, therefore it muſt be ſo. Under favour, that's no Conſequence. I ſuppoſe that you'll grant that Men don't act always up to the ſtretch of their Capacities: And that 'tis poſſible for them to be much more Prudent, Benign, and Inoffenſive, than they are.

Philot. What then? Would you have a Man a Stock, muſt he not be ſenſible of ill Uſage?

Philal. Look you, all ill Uſage proceeds from ignorance and diſorder of Mind. Thoſe that give it, are the greateſt Sufferers. They deſtroy their own Happineſs more than ours. And under this Notion they will deſerve our Compaſſion much better than our Hatred; Our Charity will take them in as naturally as *Bedlam*. 'Tis true, there may be ſome degrees of difference in the Diſtraction, but that is all. And as we may Wiſh, we may likewiſe Attempt their Welfare: Not only out of Pity, and common Alliance; but alſo from the Proſpect of a Return.

Philot. How ſo?

Philal. Why by our Kindneſs we ſhall either reform the injurious Perſon or not; if we do, the ground of our Diſlike is gone, and we have made him more commodious for our purpoſe; if we are diſappointed, we ſhall have the ſatisfaction of doing Good againſt Evil, which as 'tis the moſt divine Quality, ſo to maintain it, the Pleaſure is proportionably raiſed. There is a ſecret Triumph and Exultation of Spirit upon ſuch an occaſion. There is no one that acts in this manner who does not inwardly applaud himſelf for it; which is as much as to ſay, God bids him go on.

Philot. If we may be Kind to thoſe we believe our Enemies: If we can fall in Love with Malice and Oppoſition, then by parity of reaſon, we may court undiſguiſed Ruin, and hate our ſelves.

Philal. If by Kindneſs you mean Pity and good Wiſhes, I think it very practicable to go thus far with an Enemy; but if you enlarge your Senſe to Complacency and Affection, I grant it impoſſible. Beſides, there is no need of winding up the String thus high: We are not obliged to be pleaſed with thoſe that do us Miſchief; the Goodneſs of God himſelf does not proceed thus far. For tho he is kind to the *Unthankful* and the *Evil*, and *deſires* the *Converſion* of a *Sinner*, yet he does not delight in him while he continues ſuch.

Philot. When you have made the moſt of it, I foreſee this Latitudinarian Love will be expenſive; and therefore I would gladly be farther informed what is to be gotten by it.

Philal. Very much. In good earneſt this Quality is well worth the Courting; 'tis valuable in *Fortune*, as well as in Beauty and *Humour*. 'Twill make a Man an Intereſt in the World. It removes Difficulties, & ſmooths the Paſſage for Buſineſs; and like the Marriage of Princes, there is Policy as well as Pleaſure in the *Alliance*. You know the Trade of Life can't be driven without *Partners*; there is a reciprocal Dependance between the *Greateſt* and the *Leaſt*. And the beſt Figure is but a *Cypher*, where it ſtands alone. For this reaſon a wiſe Man will ſtrengthen the Confederacy, and take in all the Help he can get. Now there is nothing ſo engaging as a benevolent Diſpoſition. This Temper makes a Man's Behaviour inoffenſive, affable, and obliging; it multiplies Friends, and diſarms the Malice of an Enemy. He that is kind out of Principle, will be ſo to all the Advantages of Decency and Compaſs. That which is Natural, is Uniform, Conſtant, and Graceful. Whereas he who Counterfeits good Nature, he who is civil only out of Breeding or Deſign, will be apt to have *Breaks*, and Inequalities in his Humour. A Man cannot always ſtand bent; ſo that either Negligence, or Paſſion, or Intereſt, will

ſome time or other return the Poſture, and unmask the Pretence, and then the Labour is all loſt. But the natural Complexion of Goodneſs will hold.

Philot. Yes, till the Man breaks.

Philal. No fear of that. This Quality will do more than pay for its keeping. Remember that Power goes in with the Inclinations of Courſe: Get but Mens Hearts, and their Hands will follow. But to do this, there is nothing more likely than a plauſible and obliging Honeſty. The Charms of Kindneſs are irreſiſtable; they conquer, and captivate, and return with Spoil and Triumph. Beſides, the Aſſiſtance that comes from Inclination, is generally ſafer, and more ſerviceable, than that which is haled in by Force or Money. He that reigns in the Affections is the happy Prince; for in Love there's neither Treachery nor Deſertion. A Man remarkably Obliging, is almoſt proof againſt the moſt Malitious. They'll be afraid of attaquing one ſo fortified in publick Eſteem, and under ſo ſacred a Character. Though his Virtue may be over-looked, the Infamy of the Action will prevent an Injury.

Philot. Will this Diſpoſition do us any farther Service?

Philal. Yes; our Affection to others gives us a ſhare in their Happineſs, and ſo becomes an Addition to our own. Wiſhing well enlarges

larges a Man's Capacity of being Happy: This hinders his Satisfaction from being confined to his private Intereſt. He is really the better for whatever good his Neighbour enjoys; becauſe every thing of this Nature ſatisfies his deſires, and gives him that he delights in.

Philot. I warrant you his Mind is like a Burning-glaſs! The Rays of good Fortune from all diverſities of Points concenter in his Benevolence, and excite an intenſe and multiplied Pleaſure?

Philal. Yes. And in a great meaſure make him Maſter of all the Happineſs he ſees, or hears of. All proſperous Events, all Improvements of Induſtry, and Bleſſings of Providence which he is acquainted with, his excellent Temper gives him an Intereſt in; for tho he has not the Poſſeſſion of theſe things, he has what is moſt deſirable, the Satisfaction of them. Nay, I believe the generous Congratulation may be improved to exceed the Occaſion; and make a Man more happy than thoſe he rejoyces for. In this Caſe, the Laws of Nature give way for the Encouragement of Goodneſs, the Stream riſes higher than the Fountain, and the Rebound is ſtronger than the firſt Motion.

Philot. This is a new way of extracting the *Spirit* of Happineſs; the Chymiſtry of a Bee is nothing to it: It ſucks the *Sweet*, without impo-

impoveriſhing the *Flower*. Were I Maſter of this *Secret*, I would not concern my ſelf about laying in the uſual Proviſion for Satisfaction. No, I would rather chuſe to be happy at the ſecond hand, that is much the eaſier way; there the Gains come in a main, without any Venture. For Inſtance. I would not trouble my ſelf about getting an Eſtate; 'twere only Loving a Man dearly that has one, and that will do as well. But the Miſchief is, at preſent I am not a Man of that fortunate Imagination.

Philal. The power of Thought and Imagination you know is very great, and therefore 'tis prudent to ſet them the right way at work.

Philot. Be it ſo. I ſhall allow your Argument in ſome meaſure, and make my Advantage upon it.

Philal. Which way?

Philot. Why, if kind Wiſhing and Obliging are ſuch entertaining Actions; if they may be carried up to tranſport, and almoſt ſenſuality; then your general Benevolence is nothing but a refined ſort of Self-love, becauſe it acts upon a foreſeen Reward. I told you *Self* would be at the Bottom after All.

Philal. So let it, ſince it has Company. For let me tell you, to be delighted in the Happineſs of another, is ſo far from being mercenary, that 'tis an infallible proof of a natural and undiſſembled Goodneſs. How can we better demonſtrate the reality of our Affections to a Friend,

Friend, than by rejoycing at his Proſperity? As for the Pleaſure which attends ſo noble a Diſpoſition, the Expectation of that is no vitious ſelf deſign. For we are allowed to love our ſelves, as well as our Neigbour: So that the proſpect of being pleaſed does not leſſen the generoſity of the Action, if His Advantage was as ſincerely ſought, and delighted in, as our own. Therefore by Charitys not *ſeeking her own*, (which you know is made a part of its Character) is only meant, that it does not ſeek its own, without a joynt Reſpect to the Welfare of another. In ſhort, I think the Pleaſure of Congratulation is ſo far from a Fault, that the firſt Satisfaction ought rather to create a ſecond; we ſhould be pleaſed with our Pleaſure, becauſe it brings us the good News that our Minds are rightly diſpoſed.

Philot. I confeſs I am beaten off here, but hope to ſucceed better in my next Attempt.—

Philal. In the mean time give me leave to obſerve, that Envy and Diſquiet are uneaſy Paſſions; they fret and exhauſt the Spirits. The Mind is as it were ſore, and put to pain at every turn, which is a fair Intimation things are not in the Condition they ſhould be.

Philot. And what help is there for all this?

Philal. A kind reconciling Thought is preſent Remedy. This Balſamick Humour cloſes the Wound, and ſcatters the Anguiſh. Like the Motion of *Reſtitution*, it returns Nature

to

to her Eaſe, and ſets her in the Poſture ſhe was made for.

Philot. I grant you Benevolence has a healing Quality, and ſits very ſmooth at firſt. But as the World goes the Conſequences of it are more likely to make us unhappy, than otherwiſe.

Philal. How ſo?

Philot. If you look Abroad you'll find Indigence, and Diſappointment, and Vexation, much more common than Proſperity. Now this predominancy of Misfortune lyes very hard upon *Benevolence*, and makes the kindeſt People the greateſt Sufferers. Their Compaſſion riſes in proportion to their Generoſity; their Tenderneſs is more paſſive, which makes a foreign Calamity ſtrike deeper, and grow more pungent. Having ſtrong deſires to Relieve, but ſmall Abilities to effect it; their good Nature muſt needs grow troubleſome, becauſe 'twill often make 'em Wiſh thoſe things which they ſee are impoſſible to compaſs. But others who keep their Inclinations at Home, are not ſo much expoſed to diſquiet; becauſe their Paſſions and Expectations being confined to their private Intereſt, they are concerned for no Misfortune but their own.

Philal. Suppoſing what you ſay would hold, it would be no juſt diſcouragement to Goodneſs, conſidering how much it will be rewarded hereafter. But becauſe your Objection relates chiefly

chiefly to the *preſent*, I ſhall direct my Anſwer againſt that Senſe, and give it you by Parts.

I affirm therefore, That if a Man does but joyn Conſideration with his Benevolence; if his Underſtanding be good, as well as his Will, his Affection for the common Welfare will never hurt him. For

1. He will perceive that the unhappy part of the World is not ſo numerous as at firſt it appeared. Thoſe who are of low Condition, tho they may ſeem moſt Deſerted, are not the worſt Provided for. Their Fortune is little 'tis true, and ſo generally are their Deſires, which makes them want as few things as thoſe whoſe Poſſeſſions are larger. They have the Pleaſure of their Senſes as well as others; and what is denied in Variety, is ſupplied by Labour, which ſharpens the Appetite, and ſtrengthens the Conſtitution.

2. As for thoſe who are real Objects of Compaſſion, the old Maxim will in great meaſure relieve them; *Dolor, ſi gravis brevis, ſi longus levis.* At the worſt, Life and Miſery will be diſpatched e're long; and then, if they deſerve it, they are Happy; as Happy as Goodneſs can wiſh.

3. Commiſeration has a mixture of Satisfaction, as well as Trouble in it. By this a Man is conſcious he does the Office of a Friend; that he is of a generous and humane Diſpoſition. Theſe Thoughts make the Pleaſure

ſure of the Sympathy equalize the Trouble, if the Perſon be not very near, or the Calamity very great, which we are concern'd for.

Philot. There is ſomething in what you ſay; for I have obſerved that Women will Weep and Condole with abundance of Tenderneſs and Affection: I believe they are pleaſed with the Pomp and Paſſion of their Sorrow; and think themſelves the beſt Natur'd People in the World for't.

Philal. We ſhould interpret all Signs of good Nature in the faireſt Senſe. But I ſhall proceed, and obſerve

4. A wiſe Well-wiſher will conſider there is a neceſſity of Diſcipline, both to ſecure the Orderly and reclaim the Evil. Goals and Gibbets are as uſeful in a State, as great Places, and *Patents* of *Honour*. Where Goodneſs is mutable, and Reaſon unabſolute, there muſt be Rigour to fence in Duty, and check the Abuſe of Liberty. As things ſtand, 'tis not conceivable how Providence can Govern without Puniſhing. Upon this Contemplation a good Man will no more be diſturbed at the Methods of Correction, than by ſeeing his Friend take unpalatable Phyſick, which he knows to be proper for his Health. And as for thoſe who are loſt beyond Recovery, tho he wiſhes twere otherwiſe, yet their obſtinacy does not ſo deeply affect him as to make him uneaſy.

Philot.

Philot. Is not ſuch a Sedateneſs a Sign of Neglect, and Stoical Indifference?

Philal. Not at all. The Saints above are not afflicted at the Puniſhment of the damned, and yet they have Charity in perfection: But your Objection runs into an abſurd Inference. It dilutes the Happineſs of the other World, and gives Hell an Influence upon Heaven.

Philot. I have nothing farther to object, and therefore muſt be your Proſelyte: But if you have any more to ſay, let's hear it, for a Man can never be too well fortified againſt Cuſtom.

Philal. Yes. *General Kindneſs* may be recommended from the Nobleneſs of ſuch a Temper. It ſprings from a generous Root, and ſpreads and flouriſhes upon the beſt Nouriſhment imaginable. There's nothing in it that is Mercenary or Fantaſtical. 'Tis not ſupported by Chance or Humour, by Flattery or Deſign: It ſtands upon its own independent Strength, and holds on through all Oppoſition. 'Tis above Diſcouragement and ill Uſage, and not ſo much as checked into Indifferency, by frequent Injury and Provocation. I need ſay no more for this Virtue, than that 'tis the Temper of God. This Truth I ſhall take for granted. Indeed the Univerſe proves it; all the Powers and Delights of Nature are ſtanding Evidence. If Omnipotence were in other Hands than Goodneſs, we ſhould feel terrible Effects on't. Now to reſemble God is the Perfection

fection of Virtue; 'tis doing the wiſeſt and the greateſt Action in its Kind. To mention but one Advantage, We can't recommend our ſelves more effectually to God Almighty than by delighting in the ſame Actions which he does. Love naturally ariſes from Likeneſs of Diſpoſition. Our Imitation of another is an unqueſtioned proof that we value his Perſon, and admire his Choice; which lays a kind of an Obligation for a return. Such a Conſent of Wills, ſuch an Uniformity of Deſires, does as it were incorporate diſtinct Eſſences, and makes us almoſt the ſame thing with another; ſo that as long as he has a Regard for himſelf, he muſt have one for us too. By being of the ſame Temper with God Almighty, we do as it were engage his Inclinations to make us happy. While we are thus affected, he can no more be unconcerned about our Welfare, than he can deny himſelf, or put a neglect upon his own Attributes.——

Philot. You may pleaſe to hold your hand. For I am ſo far convinced, That unleſs I am Kind to others, I ſhall now be forced to fall out with my ſelf.

Philal. May the Impreſſion continue.

Philot. I hope recollecting the Reaſons, will make it do ſo.

Your Servant.

THE END.

Miſcellanies

UPON

MORAL SUBJECTS.

The Second Part.

By *Jeremy Collier*, M. A.

LONDON:

Printed for *Sam. Keeble* at the *Turks-head* in *Fleet-ſtreet*, and *Jo. Hindmarſh* at the *Golden-Ball* over againſt the *Royal-Exchange* in *Cornhill.* 1695.